SUPERNOVA

marxiste-léniniste review No.01 2026

FEDAYIN IN THE IMPERIALIST METROPOLIS
AFRICAN MARXISM
HUNGER STRIKE
MUSIC AND RESISTANCE

Table of Contents

‘Fedayn’in the imperialist metropolis
Neocolonialism, mind occupation and voluntary slavery: forms of contemporary imperialist domination
Solidarity with Palestinein Italy: Political general strikes - Interview with Antitesi, communist organisation (Italy)
Lenin and the national question: What strategy in Corsica on the question of national liberation struggles
Proletarian Investigation: The Bel Ombre Residence - A story of Cooperation and Resistance in Marseille
The legacy of Sankara and Marxism in Africa
Hunger strikes as an act of resistance: The experience of the Anatolian revolutionary left
Grup Yorum: 40 years of resistance to fascisminterview with a member of the Anatolian music group
Interview with rapper ERZIN
Gli artisti Che non abbiamoThe artists we don't have (Italy)
Creativity and individual freedom in MarxismMikhail Lifshitz
Interview with our Ecuadorian comrades MGTLMovimiento Guevarista Tierra y Libertad de Ecuador - Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores
Notes

'Fedayn'in the imperialist metropolis

"With regard to the whole, mobile warfare is primary and guerrilla warfare supplementary; with regard to the parts, guerrilla warfare is primary and mobile warfare supplementary" - Mao

This new issue inaugurates the new series of Supernova magazine. The decision to create a new series is linked to the perspectives we believe the magazine should take and to the necessary critique and self-critique of the political and editorial work accomplished by the editorial team to date.

The journal's themes of investigation and theoretical research remain the same:

- Imperialism and the French metropolitan dimension
- Class composition and the organisation of proletarian autonomy
- Resistance and the role of political activists

As Supernova, we want to wage a more direct ideological and political battle, which is also reflected at the organisational level in our membership of the Anti-Imperialist Front[1].

We are operating in a context marked by crisis processes affecting France and other imperialist countries both externally and internally:

External front: the crisis of hegemony of French imperialism, in the context of new global competition and anti-colonial and anti-imperialist resistance across its colonies and former colonies. France is still today one of the main imperialist countries, it is a member of NATO, and is one of the central forces within the EU. France directly supports Zionism and actions against all countries that are not aligned with the United States and the NATO bloc (Russia, China, Iran, Venezuela, Cuba, Yemen, North Korea, etc.) . The United States and the main EU countries represent the imperialist forces and constitute the enemy on which we must focus our forces.

Internal front: the social and political crisis that has hit France has given rise to an unprecedented situation in terms of "governance ". Government instability is the result of this crisis, which also reflects an increasingly deep division within the French imperialist monopoly bourgeoisie. However, these divisions are being reconfigured to support a war economy increasingly directed against Russia and China, in the defence of the hegemonic interests of French imperialism, and under the aegis of NATO and the European Union.

A war economy that is also manifested in the shrinking of democratic spaces and social guarantees affecting large sections of the population, particularly the proletarian sectors of working-class neighbourhoods and workers in the

metropolises. Islamophobia, anti-immigrant racism, etc. are polarizing elements in an increasingly intense 'war between the poor' which is exacerbated by imperialist ideological propaganda.

The war economy and the costs of this crisis are also affecting the middle classes and the *labour aristocracy*, the so-called 'disillusioned of globalism' (those who had believed in the dreams sold by the project of globalisation, only to have been let down) . However, this has not reached a point where it has touched the consensus around 'imperialist democracy' and other mechanisms of conformism defended by the liberal sectors, the 'NATO left'[2]and the old and new right.

The absence of significant social and political protest movements is certainly due to the social fear that, for the first time, is sweeping across France on a massive scale, but there are also serious errors on the subjective level (the political cultures of the French left). The French left is influenced and dominated by imperialism. It is a left that disarms social and political movements through its culture of liberalism. The left has been touched by issues causing it setbacks : the quick fizzling out the 'block everything' mobilizations of 10 September[3] (with trade union bureaucracy and the most naive spontaneity all playing their parts), the difficulty in accepting Palestinian resistance (led by Palestinian organisations) as a political struggle of the dominated classes within the imperialist metropolises, the inability to deal with the problems affecting the popular sectors: social precariousness, police violence, organised crime, drug use, etc., and the necessary self-defence and cooperation of the masses. These are contradictions that are impossible to ignore.

It is against this backdrop that the political consciousness and praxis of France's proletarian left are now taking shape.

IMPERIALISM AND THE METROPOLITAN DIMENSION

The Leninist category of imperialism must be understood in its deepest sense:

- horizontal dimension: class struggle (the classes)
- vertical dimension: theory of dependency, unequal exchange, value chain (north-south, centre-periphery)

In Lenin, we find a combination of these two factors. Factors, which are too often polarised by left-wing and communist groups, who fail to grasp the general perspective and dialectical relationship that links these two elements. Not as a sum of factors, but as elements integrated with each other. The nature of imperialism necessarily brings with it increasingly total winds of war, and at the same time, the deterioration of social and working conditions for sections of the *proletariat without reserves* in Europe and the United States is worsening. For today, imperialism, instead of bringing benefits to these masses, (in the form of 'imperialist rent,' as Samir Amin called it), it is in fact

worsening their living conditions. This *could* (and I stress here the conditional) favour the growth of anti-imperialist struggles on both fronts of the imperial world order; both internal and external to the imperialist metropolises. This is provided that the movements, especially within the imperialist metropolises, are able to grasp these dynamics and adopt a forward-looking mindset by breaking with the conformism of the present and the bourgeois left (the NATO left and all the ideology associated with it).

The analysis of contemporary imperialism must focus on the United States, as the sole state currently possessing a concentration of the core mechanisms of power—military, financial, and monetary. This position is denied to European or East Asian 'allies', i.e. either because they are countries that were subjugated by war (Germany, Japan, Italy), or by economic and financial dominance (France, England), and of course it is a position that above all is denied to the Global South. China and Russia are players in the new global competition, but in this sense their role cannot be described as imperialist, and they are subject to the actions of the United States and the NATO bloc, which act to maintain their hegemony and global control[4].

The impact of the United States on the global market, economic regulations, international law and diplomatic relations between states, etc., reflect an attempt to prevent the implosion of the cycle of accumulation and to revive the struggling American economy in the context of phase marked by new global competition. However, it is important for us to affirm a central point of Marxist analysis: in imperialism, political choices are becoming increasingly 'mandatory'; we talk about 'politics' because in reality everything has become 'economics'.

The intensification of racism, sexism, domestic militarization, and the deportation of migrants in the United States are only ostensibly a subjective choice of the Trump administration. The American population is deeply divided, not between the 1% and the 99%, but between the The 20% who command the bulk of consumption within the vast domestic market (3/4 of GDP) and the 80% whose purchasing power is stagnating or declining. Fiscal policies are implemented to guarantee property ownership and hyper-consumption by the richest segment of the population. Trump is 'politicising' what neoliberalism has stubbornly and unsuccessfully attempted to 'depoliticise': the use of force.

The state-capitalist machine no longer delegates the use of extreme violence to fascists; it organises it itself, perhaps from lessons learned from the use of autonomous forms by Nazism in the first half of the 20th century. The structural racism that characterises capitalism – now concentrated against Muslims – has been conveniently concealed by the Israelis and by all the Western media and the political establishment. Once again, there is no real need for new fascists, because it is these states, particularly European ones, that have fostered this since the 1980s (whereas in the United States, it is

endemic, being at the very heart of its exercise of power). Racism has been deeply rooted in democracy and capitalism since the conquest of the Americas, a place where inequality reigns; precisely because racism has been one of the primary means of legitimizing this inequality. The new 'fascists'[5] are numerically marginal compared to historical fascism and, once in power, they immediately align themselves with capital and the state, limiting themselves to intensifying authoritarian and repressive legislation and acting on symbolic and cultural matters. Trump (or Milei in Argentina) perfectly embodies the image of the 'fascist capitalist' because he represents a segment of the capitalist class and acts accordingly. The imperialist monopoly bourgeoisie is divided, both in the United States and in Europe. It is a divide between one section that holds onto the old neoliberal vision of things born in the 1990s after the United States' victory over the USSR and stemming from postmodern ideologies (and linked to narratives of "the end of history"), and another part of the monopoly bourgeoisie attentive to new scenarios of global competition and the ongoing crisis processes. The crisis has polarised all classes, even from within. Trump's actions have little or no connection with historical fascist folklore; when he operates at the geopolitical level aiming to save American capitalism from implosion, while imposing a 'fascist' trajectory on all aspects of American society. Trump perfectly combines capitalism and fascism. Capitalism no longer needs to entrust power to historical fascist regimes, as it once did, because democracy has been emptied of its substance since the 1970s (Trilateral Commission)[6]. It is an empty shell that can be used in any way. It produces war from within its own institutions – just as capitalism does from within finance and the state, from within its administration and its army.

This is also mirrored in the European imperialist countries; where the war economy is becoming the main focus of action to counter the crisis. In our metropolitan context (in France), French imperialism is the primary enemy on which to focus our resistance. Those who think France can be used to counterpose the United States, or those who that you can use the French state institutions[7] for resistance, or to sabotage the war economy, are simply working to the ends of French imperialism and its ideology, by participating in the strengthening of the reactionary mass movements that are currently sweeping across Europe and the United States.

Lenin described imperialist capitalism as reactionary, unlike the period of free competition capitalism, in which Marx still saw 'progressive' aspects. Financialization and the debt economy have created a monster that combines capitalism, democracy and fascism, which poses no problem for the ruling classes. The only use that can be made of this phase, is to redirect the *war against the working classes*, not by calling for peace, but by building resistance against imperialism, as a concrete act of popular power.

THE CURRENT COMPOSITION OF THE CLASSES AND THE

ORGANISATION OF PROLETARIAN AUTONOMY

Acting in an imperialist metropolis means being confronted with a specific class composition where; the weight of the mechanisms of finance and economic parasitism specific to imperialism, are at the centre of everything. This requires reflection on the organisation of production today[8], the so-called 'uberisation of the economy'[9] and the very relationship between man and machine through automation and AI. Social polarisation manifests itself in: the proletarianisation of the middle classes, which nevertheless remain closely linked to imperialist democracy, and in the expansion of the *de-intigrated* section of the proletariat, who are concentrated in working-class neighbourhoods where unemployment and social precariousness are the key characteristics. A proletariat who is *de-intigrated* from the central power of the state is all the same but subject to its violence: 'legal' violence from the police, and 'illegal' violence from organised crime. A *proletariat without reserves* that suffers imperialist hegemony, with its logic of death and destruction, breaking all the collective mechanisms that the popular masses give themselves to resist and live.

The weight of the middle classes and the *labour aristocracy* within trade union and social movements is very strong and also reflects the ideological orientations that these movements adopt. The development of specific imperialist ideologies is linked, in its deepest sense, to the processes of crisis affecting classes and states today.

Take, for example, the ambivalence of postmodern culture and identity-based racism. These two strongly opposed elements are in reality equivalent, born as specific products of the crisis affecting capitalism and the struggle of imperialism to maintain its hegemony over; the working classes in the imperialist metropolises, and the peoples oppressed by neo-colonialism. Post-modernist ideology (ie. New left ideology), starting from individual perception, ends up fragmenting everything, reducing lived experience to a purely personal dimension, where the affirmation of one's own experience is presumed as enough to create consensus and resistance, based collectively on the idea of a lobby of interests. Identity-based racism on the other hand is based on an ephemeral perception of collective identities, created with the illusion of protecting oneself from evil, which is always perceived as external to the community. We must also note the obsessive use today of the term 'Judeo-Christian culture' to refer to European roots. Behind this definition lies not only the old colonial racism, but also a very real construction of a 'fantastic' history, given for example the radical opposition in historical terms that the Christian tradition has had with Judaism. The myth of defence of local is nothing new; it suffices to look at historical Italian fascism which dreamed of imperial Rome, building papier-mâché palaces, while the world was under the domination of the Union Jack and Uncle Sam...

It is important to understand that all these elements coexist and permeate class

composition: gender, national and 'racial' identity, age, etc. To ignore these elements would be a mistake from a political point of view, as would presenting them as divisive factors. Terms such as intersectionality or the convergence of struggles always refer to a plane of equality and horizontality that does not exist in the class struggle. It is a vision linked to 'imperialist democracy' and liberalism[10], a cultural expression of certain classes that cannot conceive of resistance in political and military terms as they are frightened by class war. Our goal is to organise of the proletarian class, developing its capacity to exercise hegemony and force against the ruling classes.

Putting the organisation of proletarian autonomy at the centre means using the labour movement as a point of reference, and in particular to the strata of *proletarians without reserves*. We must give hegemony and strength to this class in the struggle against the imperialism on both the internal and external front.

From workplaces to working-class neighbourhoods, from schools to prisons, in trade unions, in neighbourhood committees, in movements, in cultural and sports associations, etc., we must be able to link the different aspects of the struggle: political, economic, social and cultural. This must focus on dignity, solidarity, the collective dimension, and resistance against imperialist cultural hegemony which promotes conformism, selfishness, individualism and hedonism.

Proletarian autonomy as a rejection of the logic of the bourgeois left:

1) Those who believe that a change of government can counter the imperialist monopoly bourgeoisie. This does not mean that all political forces are identical, but parliamentarianism has never succeeded in bringing about changes in political policy, except by using social and popular force on the ground to express popular power and resistance.

2) Those who propose general assemblies of citizens, insisting on the issue of participation and democracy, thinking that 'civil society' is automatically left-wing without considering it as a battleground; where reactionary mass movements and liberal tendencies are capable of creating hegemony, participation and consensus. To borrow an expression from the Italian communist Gramsci, there is an underestimation of Lenin's concepts of 'hegemony' and 'power relations'.

3) Those who talk about revolution, insurrection, popular wars, every day, obviously always place them in an undefined space-time (deferred to as an apocalyptic future). Resistance is not a moment but a process. Accumulating strength does not mean waiting for the hour X, but rather accumulating experience, capabilities, tools, acting by transforming what surrounds us and transforming ourselves.

4) Those who talk about revolution, insurrection, resistance as if it were a

game or a party blatantly demonstrating the indoctrination to which we are subjected to daily in the imperialist metropolises. To paraphrase old Koba; You can't resist while wearing silk gloves.

Proletarian autonomy means, in its deepest sense, the ability of the working classes to engage in politics, freeing themselves from the bourgeois point of view through organisation, solidarity, cooperation and resistance!

BUILDING THE ANTI-IMPERIALIST FRONT

It is not enough to identify a context; we must understand what it means today what it is to build resistance and what the role of the proletarian left is.

Today, when we intervene through our political work it means taking action within a territory where the enemy; imperialism, is hegemonic (socially, culturally and economically) in workplaces, working-class neighbourhoods, schools and prisons etc.

Ideological struggle: Countering the ideology and therefore the habits of imperialist decay among the working class. Marxist-Leninist theory, as the theory of the proletariat and oppressed peoples, against the ideology of the ruling classes (liberals, the bourgeois left, reactionaries and fascists). Marxism-Leninism as a science, and therefore like any science in constant development. Marxism-Leninism as that which takes into account the history of the communist and revolutionary movement. This means knowing how to grasp the present, while orientated towards the future, but at the same time being able to synthesise and take stock of what the communist and international movement has been. We must be able to break with 'nostalgia', but we must understand the importance of real socialism[11] and the experiences of the proletarian and revolutionary left which, within the imperialist metropolises, set themselves the concrete goal of revolutionary rupture, not as a slogan, but as a practice of resistance[12]. And on a more general level, with all those who have confronted themselves with the organisation of proletarian autonomy and resistance against the imperialist state, link theory and practice.

Political struggle: political struggle means resistance. Resistance against the war economy of French imperialism and NATO, and against its neo-colonialism and racism. Resistance as an organised struggle for the dignity, interests and guarantees of the masses in working-class neighbourhoods, workplaces, schools and prisons. Resistance not only as defence but also as a support for the anti-imperialist struggles that are liberating countries from French influence in the Sahel and in the colonies. Resistance means taking up the flag of Palestine as the flag of the oppressed masses around the world. Resistance means rejecting the logic of good guys vs. bad guys when we are attacked by the repression of the imperialist state. Resistance means supporting revolutionary political prisoners and their political identity. To

resist, we must be able to 'clean house'; only then can we hope to resist imperialism. The fight against drugs and against all the 'markets of death and violence' that dominate working-class neighbourhoods is undoubtedly an area in which resistance can demonstrate its strength in concrete terms. It is striking that 'revolutionaries' think they can fight against the imperialist state without asking themselves the question of how to build popular action, strength and discipline. The beginning of the film '*The Battle of Algiers*' is more evocative than a thousand speeches on this point.

Resistance as the capacity to organise and transform the working classes, to sabotage the organisation of capitalist labour and to fight against the imperialist state. Resistance as the socialist transformation of the masses through action and collective struggle.

Organisational dimension: building the anti-imperialist front of the proletarian and anti-imperialist left. As a space for organisation and confrontation between the metropolitan proletariat and the oppressed peoples. The anti-imperialist front, born under the impetus of the Anatolian comrades of the Popular Front (an organisation of the Anatolian revolutionary left), organises precisely at this level. The characteristic features that distinguish this experience are one of a : '*revolutionary movements committed to Marxist-Leninist ideology and armed struggle. The main strategy of imperialism is to eliminate this threat. Once this threat is eliminated, American imperialism will have no more obstacles to overcome. That is why resistance is necessary!*'[13].

We at "Supernova" we are attentive to all instances of organisation, confrontation and experimentation in France produced by parties, organisations groups and collectives of the proletarian left[14], but at the same time, we have had to acknowledge a degree of immaturity, conformism, liberalism and 'nostalgia' within the proletarian left movement. We ourselves have not been immune to these flaws. That is why we made the organisational choice to participate in the construction of the Anti-Imperialist Front, because it is essential to link the issues imperialisms external front to those of its internal front, in our struggles within the imperialist metropolis. By engaging and joining forces with organisations resisting imperialism at the international level, from the Middle East to Africa, from Asia to South America.

Taking on organisational and therefore collective work, capable of overcoming localism and the flaws of the 'Western radical left' polarised between 'liberal informalism' and 'stereotypical formality'. Organising within the Anti-Imperialist Front does not mean the artificial use of programmes and models specific to other contexts. The characteristics of imperialist metropolises must necessarily have their own programme. The contribution of our journal has always been oriented in this direction, namely to adapt to the specific context in which we live and operate. This is where our contribution to the Anti-Imperialist Front lies.

Neocolonialism, mind occupation and voluntary slavery: forms of contemporary imperialist domination

Neither its ideological and cultural attacks, nor its political and military assaults will be able to destroy the resistance of the peoples, nor will they be able to destroy the struggle for revolution and socialism. Through resisting, organizing, and fighting, we will put an end to the domination of imperialism and its collaborators, and we will establish socialism.

Today, the world is witnessing one of the greatest inequalities in history. Monopoly capital groups led by the United States, the centre of the imperialist-capitalist system, have surrounded the world with political, military, economic, and cultural tools, offering nothing to oppressed peoples other than hunger, poverty, war, and migration. A handful of imperialist monopolies transfer the world's wealth to their own coffers while condemning billions of people to live in misery, unemployment, and insecurity.

The United States, as the leading imperialist power, along with its regional collaborators, controls the world and subjugates peoples through various methods and instruments.

The world has not changed; imperialism remains the same: the main contradiction is between the peoples of the world and imperialism. How did imperialism, led by the U.S., bring the world to this point? What has been done, what have others said, and what will we do? We will try to reveal both the historical and current policies of imperialism and the revolutionary, ideological, political, and historical framework that must be followed in response.

I. THE POLICIES OF IMPERIALISM AND PERIODIC PROCESSES

- Post-1945 reconstruction
- Neo-colonialism
- Post-Soviet period
- Neoliberal aggression
- The American empire
- Voluntary slavery and artificial intelligence

1. Post-1945: A New Imperialist Design Led by the U.S.

According to Lenin, imperialism is the highest stage of capitalism, a stage dominated by monopoly capital, financial capital, and the struggle to divide

world markets. This contradiction is expressed not only between rich and poor countries but also between labor and capital, and between peoples and collaborationist administrations.

IMPERIALISM WILL BE DEFEATED; THE PEOPLES OF THE WORLD WILL WIN

Neither its ideological and cultural attacks nor its political and military assaults will destroy the resistance of the peoples or the struggle for revolution and socialism. By resisting, organizing, and fighting, we will end the dominance of imperialism and its collaborators and establish socialism.

During World War II, imperialism was defeated by socialism and lost one-third of the world markets.

Europe, defeated in the imperialist world wars, left the role of global policing to the U.S. due to the necessity of integration. Even European security was essentially entrusted to the U.S. through NATO.

U.S. imperialism replaced European capital, asserting its leadership. Through the Bretton Woods agreements (IMF, World Bank), NATO, the Marshall Plan, and the Truman Doctrine, the reproduction of global capital was reorganized.

While classical forms of colonialism were abandoned under the mask of "independence," they were replaced by a new, more insidious form of domination: neo-colonialism.

Mahir Çayan defined neo-colonialism as "the process by which countries nominally independent under the mask of sovereignty are made economically, politically, and culturally dependent on imperialism." Burkina Faso revolutionary leader Thomas Sankara compared it to "a white stone in rice: it is the same colour as rice but hard and breaks teeth," distinguishing it from classical colonialism.

Imperialism, while not abandoning classic methods, now attacks not with tanks and artillery but with credit; not with occupation armies but with development agencies, bilateral agreements, and international institutions. To suppress the peoples' struggles for freedom, global organizations like NATO, IMF, World Bank, WTO, UN Security Council, G7, G20, and local collaborators are deployed to ensure the "smooth" exploitation of the world.

1. 1960–1980: Imperialist Intervention Against Winds of Independence and Socialism

During this period, national liberation struggles in Africa, Asia, and Latin America threatened imperialist powers, primarily the U.S. The Cuban Revolution, Vietnam's victory, Angola, Mozambique, and other examples increased interest in socialism, while U.S. imperialism responded with coups (Chile, Indonesia, Turkey 1971), invasions, and covert operations.

Neo-colonialism was consolidated through "development programs" in

underdeveloped countries via the IMF and World Bank, indebting populations through collaborationist bourgeoisies.

1. 1980–1991: Neoliberal Assaults and the Strangulation of Socialism

The late 1970s crisis led the imperialist system toward neoliberal attacks: free-market policies, privatization, deregulation, and the erosion of workers' rights. IMF and World Bank Structural Adjustment Programs dismantled public property, deepened exploitation, impoverished the working class, and suppressed class struggle. Turkey's January 24, 1980, policies and the September 12 military coup epitomized this process.

Meanwhile, post-Stalin Soviet Union faced reformist and revisionist attacks, weakening the foundations of socialism. Gorbachev's glasnost and perestroika policies, alongside imperialist pressure, forced the Soviet Union toward collapse. The 1991 collapse was hailed as a "victory" by imperialism.

1. Collapse of the USSR and the "Unipolar" World

With the Soviet collapse, no systematic alternative remained, emboldening U.S. imperialism. Globalism and globalization were promoted ideologically, erasing class struggles and pushing peoples into despair. Socialist symbols were removed, reformist and conciliatory trends dominated, and leftist movements were ideologically weakened.

1. 1991–2008: Imperialism's "New World Order"

Following the Soviet collapse, U.S. imperialism declared the "end of history." Eastern Bloc countries were plundered via World Bank and IMF policies. NATO expanded, Yugoslavia was divided through imperialist interventions, and Iraq was invaded in 1991. The "unipolar world" strategy and neoliberal globalization intensified exploitation, associating any resistance with terrorism. Ideological hegemony was enforced through media, academia, and culture.

1. Post-2008: Crisis of the "New World Order" and Lines of Resistance

The 2008 financial crisis exposed capitalism's structural weaknesses. While the U.S. was central to the crisis, China, Russia, Iran, and other regional powers developed alternative centres of influence, forming blocs like BRICS and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization. China's Belt and Road Initiative and African infrastructure investments represent a shift from classical imperialism. China-Russia partnerships extend military and economic influence across over a hundred countries, giving China influence over 80% of global resources.

Meanwhile, U.S.-led imperialism faces severe economic, military, and cultural crises, deepened by domestic exploitation. Strikes and protests are increasing. The COVID-19 pandemic exposed the weaknesses of imperialist

health systems, showing their reliance solely on capital and profit. As imperialism's crises and fears grow, attacks on world populations intensify.

1. The Greater Middle East Project (GMP) and the Broader Middle East and North Africa Initiative (BMENA)

GMP, proposed by the U.S. in the 2000s, aims to reshape the Middle East and surrounding regions according to U.S. interests. The post-1990 "New World Order" policies of imperialism, aimed at global redistribution and expanding exploitation, reached a new stage with GMP and BMENA.

Officially announced by George W. Bush in 2003, Condoleezza Rice stated: "The Middle East is in labour pains. A new Middle East is being born. This is the end of the old Middle East. The borders and regimes of 22 countries will change."

According to this project:

- "Authoritarian" regimes would be transformed under the guise of democracy.
- Resistance dynamics threatening U.S. dominance would be suppressed.
- Control over oil, gas, and energy routes would be secured.
- Israel's security would be guaranteed, consolidating U.S. hegemony.

Target regions include the Middle East (Iraq, Iran, Syria, Lebanon, Palestine, Egypt), Gulf countries, North Africa (Libya, Algeria, Tunisia, Morocco), South Asia (Pakistan, Afghanistan), the Caucasus (Armenia, Azerbaijan), and Turkey. **BMENA** represents a wider and institutionalized version of **GMP**, announced in 2004 at the G8 Summit, including North Africa and South Asia, with the U.S., EU, and NATO integrated into the project.

Recent Results of GMP/BMENA:

- **Iraq (2003):** Nearly one million killed under the pretext of weapons of mass destruction; Saddam Hussein executed; oil and rare minerals transferred to U.S. companies.
- **Libya (2011):** Gaddafi lynched under the guise of democracy; the country fragmented into tribal conflicts; U.S.-backed militias looted the nation.
- **Afghanistan (2001–2021):** After 20 years of occupation, the U.S. withdrew, leaving tens of thousands dead, destroyed infrastructure, and armed militias; the Taliban took over, and the country became a stage for U.S. proxy wars.

1. 2020 and Beyond: The Age of Artificial Intelligence and Imperialism's Digital Aggression

The COVID-19 pandemic revealed imperialism's capacity to establish ideological hegemony through both biopolitics and digitalization. Tools such

as artificial intelligence, big data, and algorithmic governance were used not only for economic control but also to establish perceptual and cultural dominance. U.S.-based tech monopolies (Google, Amazon, Meta, Microsoft, etc.) have become the main actors in global data exploitation.

Imperialism now targets not only land but also minds. Algorithms have become the most effective weapon in shaping public consciousness. In this new era, ideological struggle is concentrated in cognitive and cultural arenas.

1. **Voluntary Slavery and Ideological Submission**

The form of imperialist hegemony is no longer merely coercion but **voluntary slavery**. Voluntary slavery means aligning one's own interests with those of imperialism, dissolving one's identity, intellect, reason, and will within the imperialist system. Hollywood, social media algorithms, and cultural degeneration mechanisms are turning society into passivity, silence, and resigned helplessness.

As a result, the glorification of individualism, selfishness, nationalism, and apoliticism weakens the ideological resistance of peoples. Just as the kings and lords of the past enslaved populations, today monopolists like Musk and Pichai dominate human consciousness. With the rise of the "AI era," the chains of domination have become invisible yet tighter.

II. THE NEW NAME OF SLAVERY: THE AMERICAN EMPIRE

Today, the world faces the most brazen, destructive, and overt system of exploitation in history: **America**. Some call it "new imperialism," others "global capitalism." In reality, what stands before us is American imperialism: a parasite feeding on the wealth of peoples, destroying social structures, annihilating personalities, and seizing global resources.

The so-called Greater Middle East Project (GMP) and its expanded version (BMENA) aim to plunder the underground and surface wealth of the Middle East and North Africa, exploit the labor of the poor, and subjugate countries like Iraq, Libya, and Syria that refused to be part of the imperialist chain for nearly 50 years, using outright lawlessness and banditry.

American imperialism no longer hides behind masks; it is an empire that no longer pretends with liberalism or democracy and does not even need to tell "democracy stories" to peoples. This is **fascism**.

1. **The End of the Democracy Myth, Fall of the Liberal Mask: Elections, Parliaments, Representation Are Over**

In the new imperial form, the U.S. no longer needs parliaments, elections, or representative mechanisms. These are now considered cumbersome and unnecessary. Imperialism no longer claims to "export democracy" because it is too costly. Instead, it imposes direct subjugation, direct slavery, and direct rule. Voluntary consent is replaced by voluntary slavery.

Governance in the U.S. is now directly in the hands of imperialist monopolies.

The real owners of the state sit in the White House, not bureaucrats. Silicon Valley and Wall Street are the true rulers. The prominence of Musk, Zuckerberg, and Bezos at Trump's inauguration, accompanied by drones in the sky, is no coincidence. This is the face of the new world order.

1. **A New Form of Colonialism: Non-Annexation Slavery**

American imperialism no longer covertly seizes territories—it does so openly. Countries are not formally annexed because annexation implies legal rights. Instead, new colonial states appear independent but have their sovereignty completely neutralized.

In Syria, hardline figures like al-Sharaa replace legitimate leadership; in Ukraine, subordination is enforced through "precious mineral agreements." Palestine is bombed, levelled, and tens of thousands of Palestinians are killed. The same scenario is now being applied to Iran. The goal is not only to seize land and resources but to dominate the peoples, personalities, and wills completely. Seizure has become an international norm. Regime changes are legitimized; overthrowing legitimate governments is now part of the global plunder system.

1. **Seizure Has Become the Norm**

American imperialism has gone beyond legitimizing seizure. Seizure itself has become normalized. International institutions remain silent regarding the robbed rights, countries, and resources because NATO, UN, World Bank, and IMF are all part of the plunder system. Imperialism now topples "legitimate governments" and installs collaborators—Islamist or "leftist," it does not matter—whose role is to convince people of American slavery.

1. **Form of Domination: Voluntary Slavery and Open Fascism**

Peoples are no longer told "you are free"; they are told, "Obey or perish." The American empire establishes dominance through two methods:

- **Forced imposition (fascism)**
- **Voluntary slavery (ideological submission)**

This voluntary slavery is forged through ideological bombardment, cultural degeneration, Hollywood series, and social media algorithms. People's souls are destroyed, their personalities killed, their minds paralyzed. Slaves are not only made to work—they are expected to think, feel, and live for their masters.

There is no longer hidden occupation in minds; it is open. The message is: "Your brains belong to me." Peoples must identify their interests with America's and declare: "I have no interests; America's interests are mine." This is fascism and the new form of slavery.

1. **The New Era of Imperialism: No Threat Beyond Armed Struggle**

For imperialism, popular liberation wars, revolutions, and socialism are no longer significant threats—they have largely been neutralized. From Latin America to Asia, revolutionary movements have been reformed; the "left" has submitted to imperialist ideological hegemony. Reformists claiming "democracy" have been co-opted into fascism under the guise of anti-fascism.

Only one remaining threat exists: revolutionary movements committed to Marxist-Leninist ideology and armed struggle. Imperialism's main strategy is to eliminate this threat. Once eliminated, the American empire will face no obstacles.

This is why resistance is necessary.

III. THE CRISIS OF IMPERIALISM AND IDEOLOGICAL HEGEMONY ATTACKS

The imperialist-capitalist system is experiencing one of the greatest crises in its history. This crisis, which became visible with the 2008 global financial collapse, is not a temporary slowdown but a structural collapse. The potential for developing capitalism's means of production has been exhausted, the capacity to create new markets has disappeared, and the possibilities for expanding surplus-value exploitation have narrowed.

Lenin's diagnosis of "decaying capitalism" is now fully evident. This decay is not only economic but also political, cultural, and moral. Today, imperialism imposes itself not only through armed force but also via ideological bombardment. This hegemony is maintained not only through physical occupation but also through the occupation of minds, languages, and emotions. The system of values governing society is now shaped by a handful of monopolistic capitalists through media, academia, and digital platforms wrapped in cultural packaging.

1. The Depth of the Crisis and Ideological Manipulation

For the U.S. and EU-centered capitalist bloc, production costs have become unsustainable. As a result, production has been shifted to the Far East, China, and South Asia; the core countries now maintain their existence only through finance, technology, and war machinery. But even this is not a solution, because contradictions no longer respect geographic boundaries.

Imperialism's crisis extends beyond the economy into social and political domains. At this point, the "ideological hegemony attack" comes into play. This is no longer merely a form of governance based on consent; it has become the foundation of a system of voluntary slavery. Peoples, workers, and youth are constantly told: "Be an individual, dream, brand yourself, be unique, be successful." This propaganda of individualism serves to suffocate collective struggle, class solidarity, and revolutionary alternatives.

1. From Academia to Cinema, Religion to Identity: Total Encirclement

Universities are no longer centres of science but hubs producing imperialist ideological tools. Counter-revolutionary theses and anti-people ideologies are marketed under the guise of "free thought."

Religion has been corrupted in collaboration with imperialism, becoming a tool to dull the pain of the people. Today's Islamism functions as a cultural complement to imperialist ideology. Identity politics replace class struggle, channelling the energy of the people into cultural polarization. Labor-capital conflicts are pushed backstage, while gender, native-migrant, and ethnic-cultural clashes are highlighted. This is a deliberate attack by the capitalist order.

1. The New Wave of Fascist Attack and Institutionalization of Voluntary Slavery

As the imperialist-capitalist system deepens its structural crisis, it drops the "democracy" mask and deploys overt coercive tools. The global authoritarianism we witness today, including police violence, militarism, and anti-people laws, is not accidental—it is a systemic response to imperialism's crisis. Fascism is no longer a governance form limited to individual countries; it has become the general trend of the imperialist system.

a. Fascism as a Means to Manage the Crisis

Lenin's definition of imperialism as "monopoly capitalism" allows us to understand Hitler's fascism not merely as an ideological deviation but as a form of class dictatorship resorted to by the bourgeoisie as a last measure. Today, a new form of fascism emerges: institutionalized and reliant on mass consent.

- States build police regimes under the name of "security."
- Media monopolies shape public perception.
- Courts, laws, and constitutional institutions serve as guardians of capital.

However, this process does not operate purely by force. Alongside coercion, a simultaneous process of producing consent—internalized and legitimized—takes place.

b. How Voluntary Slavery Becomes Institutionalized

People are now enslaved not only through coercion but also ideologically. Imperialism conquers minds not with warplanes alone but with Netflix series, social media algorithms, and promises of "freedom." This institutionalization operates through several channels:

- **Work life:** Flexible production, precarity, and remote work make people exploited not only at workplaces but within a 24-hour digital chain of captivity.

- **Education:** Critical, scientific thought is replaced with competition, individualism, obedience, and status obsession; youth are condemned to a future without prospects and to "credentialed ignorance."
- **Culture:** Art and culture are no longer spaces of purification but profit vehicles. Every form of resistance is either destroyed or commodified, emptied of content.

Today's slavery appears "voluntary" because modern fascism builds a "consent system" into minds and constructs prisons in brains. This fascism feeds not on 20th-century mass rallies but on individualized surveillance networks, automated censorship, digital criminal records, and algorithmic governance. The bourgeoisie now seeks to dominate the proletariat not only physically but also psychologically, digitally, and culturally. Yet this also reveals capitalism's ultimate exhaustion: increased fascist pressures simultaneously demand resistance.

1. A System Without Exit: A New "Consent Production" Is Impossible

Imperialism now markets itself not with promises of "prosperity" but with proposals to "live with less destruction." The capitalist system can no longer produce consent within itself. Building a new "liberal democracy" is impossible. The scale of the crisis has rendered fascism systematic. Imperialism fears uprisings both internally and externally. Hence, media monopolization, deepening digital surveillance, and war-mongering are normalized.

All these processes reflect the ideological crisis of the imperialist-capitalist system. Imperialism is not only in a production crisis but also a crisis of meaning, value, and legitimacy. At this point, revolutionary ideology gains legitimacy for the oppressed, because only Marxist-Leninist theory can explain the class character of these crises and offer a real path forward.

IV. TOOLS OF IMPERIALIST HEGEMONY

1. Military Occupation: "Peace" at the Barrel of a Gun

For imperialism, military force justifies the bombs raining down on peoples under the mask of "democracy" and "freedom." From the Balkan breakup to the Iraq invasion, from Afghanistan's prolonged siege to Libya's destruction, imperialism seeks to make peoples kneel through military power.

- NATO's bombing of Yugoslavia in 1999 attacked the last bastions of socialism.
- The 2003 Iraq invasion was an imperial war to secure control over oil, energy routes, Israel's security, and to shape the "new Middle East."
- Imperialist intervention in Syria is part of the GMP, aiming to

encircle powers like Russia and Iran and fragment the region.

1. **Economic Dependency: Chains from IMF, Labor from the US**

Imperialism that arrives through military occupation holds peoples' futures hostage through economic dependency chains. Institutions like the IMF, World Bank, and WTO enforce debt policies, pushing countries toward privatization and transferring public resources cheaply to capital.

- In Turkey, post-1980 coup neoliberal reforms under Özal, IMF control during the 2001 crisis, and deepening under the AKP after 2002 exemplify this.
- Arbitration laws grant unlimited rights to imperialist companies, bypassing national judiciary.
- Agreements like GATT and GATS handed agriculture and services to imperialist monopolies, effectively exhausting these sectors.

While the population grows poorer, imperialists and collaborator monopolies accumulate profits. Economic dependency also mortgages a country's political decision-making sovereignty.

1. **Ideological Bombardment: Explosions in the Mind**

Imperialist dominance is established not only through tanks and artillery but also via textbooks, TV series, and academic concepts. Ideological hegemony shapes how people think, value, and even dream—a "cultural occupation."

Education systems, under local collaborator elites, are moulded to imperialist truths. Liberal individualism, competition, and "entrepreneurship" are glorified while collectivism, solidarity, and class struggle are erased. Media empties concepts like "success," "happiness," and "freedom," constructing a life according to the needs of the dominant ideology.

From what people eat and drink to how they think, an ideological domination is established, preventing them from envisioning alternatives. Ideological bombardment is the most insidious imperialist weapon.

1. **Political Intervention: Coups, Counter-guerrillas, and the "Democracy" Mask**

Imperialism sees the will of the people as dangerous. Hence, for every popular, independent, or anti-imperialist rise, imperialism intervenes politically: anti-terror laws, counterguerrilla organizations, coup generals, and co-opted politicians block the people globally—from Latin America to the Middle East, Asia, and Africa.

- Examples include Turkey's March 12, September 12, and July 15 events; Chile's coup against Allende; post-Saddam regimes in Iraq; and sanctions against Palestine after Hamas won elections.

"Democracy" and "human rights" become tools of imperialism, with decision-making power over peoples ceded to imperialists.

1. **Cultural Degeneration: From Hollywood to Drugs**

To subjugate a people, first corrupt their culture. Imperialism knows this well. Hollywood, Netflix, the music industry, and consumer culture erode peoples' values. The imposed "lifestyle" creates a consumption-focused, individualistic, apolitical, and selfish personality type.

Youth are targeted via drugs, mafia series, depictions of violence and sexuality, dulling their spirit of resistance. Cultural assaults erasing collective memory also serve imperialist hegemony, transforming occupied minds into "voluntary slaves."

In conclusion, imperialism is not merely an economic system but a multidimensional mechanism of domination and occupation. It operates through tanks, dollars, TV series, academia, and judicial authority. Therefore, the struggle against imperialism must take place not only in the streets but also in schools, factories, screens, dining tables, and consciousness—that is, in every moment of daily life.

V. HOW DOES THE U.S. RULE THE WORLD?

1. **Anti-Terror Laws**

The "war on terror" doctrine, implemented worldwide after September 11, 2001, serves as a tool to legitimize U.S. military and political interventions. The concept of "terror" is arbitrarily defined, targeting popular movements, national liberation struggles, and revolutionary organizations. The new method of imperialism is to ideologically declare those who do not submit as "terrorists" and impose a "either you are with us or you are a terrorist" ultimatum, forcing all anti-imperialist and opposition forces worldwide into submission.

Countries or organizations that refuse to comply with this ultimatum are immediately labelled as terrorist, listed on "terror lists," and attacked. The first target was the Taliban regime in Afghanistan, and the campaign continued thereafter.

The U.S. invasion of Iraq under the pretext of "fighting terrorism" caused the deaths of over one million civilians. In Turkey, the Anti-Terror Law (TMK) has been used to silence revolutionaries, socialists, and those struggling for rights and freedoms. Families of TAYAD members, for instance, have been criminalized and imprisoned merely for taking care of their children.

1. **World Bank Decisions**

The World Bank, under the guise of "development," actually functions as an imperialist supervision tool, imposing structural adjustment programs on dependent countries. These decisions force countries to dismantle public services, privatize, and submit agriculture and commerce to the control of imperialist monopolies.

In Turkey after 1980, thousands of state-owned enterprises (KİTs) were

privatized following directives from the World Bank and IMF. Today, healthcare and education services have become monetized, leaving the population unable to access even basic needs.

1. **NATO Decisions**

Although NATO is presented as a "defensive alliance," it actually serves as a U.S. military control instrument globally. Every intervention conducted under NATO authority is, in reality, a form of imperialist aggression.

In 1999, Yugoslavia was destroyed by NATO aircraft; in Libya in 2011, NATO bombings fragmented the country.

Turkey's Role: As a NATO member, Turkey provides logistical and military support for these interventions. The Incirlik Air Base serves as a hub for imperialist operations in the Middle East.

1. **U.S. Strategic Concept Decisions**

The U.S. updates its "National Security Strategy" every few years to designate which countries are threats and which are targets. These decisions guide military, political, and economic operations worldwide.

For example, after labeling China as a "strategic competitor," the U.S. increased military deployments in the Pacific to secure its commercial interests in the region. The U.S. tries to shape Turkey according to its interests in the Middle East, directly intervening in every government under the guise of a "strategic partnership."

VI. HOW DOES THE U.S. OCCUPY COUNTRIES?

1. **Through NATO Decisions**

Every intervention initiated under NATO's pretext of "collective security" is, in fact, an occupation operation. First, internal unrest is created in the target country, and then the intervention is presented as an "international mission."

Imperialist domination is established not only with tanks and artillery but also through school textbooks, TV series, and academic concepts. Ideological hegemony shapes how people think, their value systems, and even how they imagine the world. This is a form of "cultural occupation."

The invasion of Afghanistan (2001) took place under NATO's umbrella. The result, however, was destruction, poverty, and the Taliban's resurgence.

1. **Through UN Decisions**

The United Nations has become a platform used by the U.S. to legitimize its international interventions. Under the rhetoric of "humanitarian intervention" or "peacekeeping," popular resistance is suppressed.

For example, the 1991 Gulf War intervention in Iraq was justified with a UN resolution. The objective was not to protect the people but to "secure" the oil.

1. **Direct Occupation**

Sometimes imperialist states occupy countries directly, without relying on any international resolution. This aggression reveals the true nature of imperialism in its rawest form.

The 2003 invasion of Iraq is an example: the U.S. and the U.K. attacked Iraq without any international mandate, resulting in the deaths of over one million people.

IN CONCLUSION:

Today, the world's peoples are bound by chains of imperialism. The links of this chain are built through anti-terror laws, World Bank and NATO decisions, U.S. strategic directives, and direct occupations.

VII. DIGITAL IMPERIALISM, ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE, AND ALGORITHMIC WARFARE

1. Technology in the Age of Imperialism: Not Neutral, a Weapon in the Hands of Monopolies

Technological developments are never classless or neutral. Under capitalism, technology is used to increase profit, intensify labour control, centralize the production process, and reinforce ideological hegemony. Artificial intelligence, big data, and digital surveillance systems are currently the most advanced tools fulfilling these functions.

Just as the steam engine transformed production relations in the 19th century, today, AI:

- Separates the workforce into "necessary" and "unnecessary" for capital,
- Extends surveillance and control mechanisms across society,
- Paralyzes class consciousness through perception management.

This technological transformation is not merely a technical matter; it is a new front in the class struggle and a weapon in the hands of monopolies.

1. "Digital Imperialism" and Data-Based "Colonialism"

Just as classical imperialism controlled dependent countries through raw materials and markets, "digital imperialism" today establishes similar domination via the control of information, communication, and data. This new form of colonialism operates through:

- Metadata collection and tracking/predicting user behaviour,
- Social media algorithms as tools for guiding public opinion and taming social opposition,
- Dependence on digital infrastructure, i.e., reliance on monopolistic companies like Google, Amazon, and Microsoft.

As cloud services, digital archiving, and AI infrastructures become concentrated in the hands of imperialist corporations, dependent countries become reliant on external actors in digital decision-making processes.

For newly colonized countries like Turkey, digital sovereignty is, like economic, social, and political independence, a matter of national security and class dominance.

1. **Algorithmic Hegemony and the Distortion of Reality**

One of the most insidious tools of the capitalist digital order is ideological encirclement through algorithms. Social media platforms, news feeds, and content recommendation systems:

- Manipulate people's interests,
- Censor or render revolutionary content invisible,
- Isolate individuals, weakening the idea of collective struggle,
- Distort the perception of "reality" to construct mass falsehoods (e.g., NATO's one-sided propaganda during the Ukraine-Russia War; equating Palestinian resistance with terrorism).

This hegemony is the digital version of producing consent. Social consent is established through screens and algorithms, guiding people ideologically not as conscious agents but as data points, turning them into chainless slaves.

1. **Artificial Intelligence and the Reproduction of Bourgeois Ideology**

AI systems are used not only in data analysis but also in cultural production. AI-assisted content creation in art, literature, history, and language reproduces bourgeois ideology.

In education and media, AI-driven censorship, content filtering, and curriculum design shape the historical and class consciousness of the people. Chatbots, content recommenders, and AI-advisory systems repackage political ideologies in a "neutralized" form, directing masses toward liberalism and reformism.

Thus, AI is not merely a technological tool but a new-generation extension of the imperialist ideological apparatus.

1. **Technology Must Serve the People through Open Sources**

The revolutionary and socialist stance against digital hegemony must be clear: resistance against digital monopolies cannot be separated from the struggle against imperialism. Technology serves the class that controls it. Knowledge production and dissemination must be publicly accessible and open-source, not handed over to monopolies. Alternative media and digital networks should be established for organization and revolutionary education.

AI must be removed from private property and market control and made available to the people through open sources. Revolutionaries are not against AI or technological development itself, but against its use under capitalist-imperialist domination. Any technological tool that benefits the working classes is only possible under the process of revolutionary popular power.

Solidarity with Palestinein Italy: Political general strikes - Interview with Antitesi, communist organisation (Italy)

The Palestinian question and the political polarisation it has created at the international scale has become the main front in the struggle against imperialism and therefore in the class struggle itself. In France, solidarity with Palestine has explicitly linked the external front: imperialist domination and its support for Zionism – to the internal front: policies linked to the war economy with the reduction of social and democratic spaces for the working classes. Here we see how 'imperialist democracy' has started to reduce investment in the mechanisms it used for internal social integration (linked to stability and imperialist hegemony) in order to shift to the 'fascistisation' of society in response to the context of crisis and increased global competition.

There is sincere support for the Palestinian cause in working-class neighbourhoods, even if it is mainly indirect and silent. Various factors have contributed to this. The repression that has hit pro-Palestinian political sectors (from parliamentary forces to revolutionary left-wing groups and trade unions)and the real terror this has created towards those who show direct support for Palestine has played a role in this, as has the conformism and fatalistic resignation typical of the cultures that dominate the working classes. Another factor has been due to the degree of influence within the left, that liberal tendencies have. These are often presented under the guise of the "decolonial movement," yet end up defending the worst Western stereotypes. In this regard, their absolute silence in regards to those who represent resistance is significant (the underlying logic is that one can support the colonized only when they are defenceless but that support ends when they begin to defend themselves) .

All this should not, however, make us forget that there were political and social sectors that mobilised through demonstrations, picket lines and boycotts: in airports, ports and in front of companies that produce military equipment for the Zionist occupier, linking support for Palestine to the struggle against the war policies of French imperialism.

In this context, the solidarity movement with Palestine that has swept across Italy represents a remarkable quantitative and qualitative leap forward in comparison to the Palestinian solidarity movement in France. In these movements in general, it has been the youth who have represent the dynamic and energetic elements. However, real critical awareness and radicalism emerge only with the direct participation of workers and the popular classes in the struggle. It has exactly this that has played out on a massive scale in Italy. We discuss this, and more generally the particularities of the Italian Palestinian solidarity movement; with our Italian comrades from Antitesi (antitesirivista.org).

1) The mobilisations that swept across Italy in solidarity with Palestine had a significant international impact. We believe that this is due not only to the massive demonstrations of support, but also to the forms of struggle that the movement has adopted in Italy. What is your point of view?

In Italy, since the Al Aqsa flood and the beginning of the Zionist genocidal aggression in Gaza, we had not yet seen massive mobilisations (in contrast with other European capitals). Over the last two years, the movement has mobilised around universities and Palestinian solidarity organisations (such as Giovani Palestinesi, Udap, Api, etc.), with

the support of various solidarity forces. The largest of the demonstrations took place on 5 October 2024 in Rome, when more than 10,000 comrades defied the government ban and clashed with the police. It is difficult to say exactly what caused the situation to boil over. In a way, the huge demonstrations in September and October 2025 took everyone a little by surprise. During the summer, it was already clear that something was changing, and that the launch of the Sumud Flotilla was serving in giving the masses a concrete goal around which they could mobilise and find their place in the mobilisation. The Sumud Flotilla assumed the role of an legitimate and universally recognised centre of mobilisation, broadening participation and involving young people and workers.

The movement developed by taking up the slogan ‘block everything’, launched by the dockers of Genoa, as a concrete response to the Zionist blockade imposed on the Flotilla. This practical demonstration aroused great determination on the part of the masses. It clearly showed that, in the face of genocide and the complicity of the Meloni government, marching was not enough. This concrete approach was a mobilising force and an encouragement to participate. Thus, hundreds of thousands of people of all ages, but mainly young people, took to the streets and blocked ports, railway stations, airports, ring roads and motorways, from large cities to smaller towns.

It was a memorable turning point, given that a few months earlier, the Italian government had approved the security decree, which increased penalties for road blockades and service interruptions. This means that, at the mass level, the repression did not have the desired effect. On the contrary, the mobilisations in support of Palestine resumed and revived the practice implemented by striking metalworkers who, a few months earlier, had massively blocked the Bologna ring road, sending the security decree they’d been served, back to its sender.

Italy had not seen a movement of this magnitude for a long time, at least not since the mobilisations against the US war of aggression against Iraq. The fundamental difference is that at the time, ‘bourgeois pacifism’ played a predominant role in the mobilisations, whereas today, support for the Palestinian people emphasises support for their resistance. The horrified faces of Italian Zionists, who complain about the presence of a banner celebrating 7 October at the head of the million-strong march in Rome on 4 October, make us understand how legitimate and viable the line supporting resistance is in this mobilisation.

In reality, it is precisely the Palestinian resistance's ability to fight the Zionist occupation and stand up to the imperialists (led by the United States) who promote and support it; that has sparked a wave of mobilisations in which the anger of large sections of the population has been articulated, against the conditions of exploitation and oppression that are worsening in Italy as a result of the crisis and the state of war.

2) We believe that workers have played a central role in the movement for Palestine in Italy. Which sectors have been mainly mobilised and which organisations have mobilised?

The dockworkers of Genoa played a fundamental leading role: one of them was on the flotilla and it was they who launched the call to block everything. The Genoa dockworkers have a long history of opposition to arms trafficking and of mobilising in solidarity with peoples attacked by imperialism since the war in Yemen. Around them, dockers from other cities, such as Livorno, immediately mobilised. But that's not all: railway workers and airport loading and unloading service employees also identified arms trafficking to the Zionist entity as a target to be reached and blocked.

Teachers attacked by the government, which is trying to force them to play the undesirable role of reproducing the dominant warmongering ideology, have also played a leading role. Numerious times the Education Minister Valditara has intervened to threaten with dismissal and suspension, teachers who talk about Palestine in schools.

These are the most active sectors, but support for the Palestinian cause has been much broader: from university researchers, who boycott agreements between Italian and Zionist universities, to musicians in theatre orchestras, who have waved the Palestinian flag during performances – such as the La Scala theatre employee who was dismissed for this reason; workers at Leonardo (a military engineering and metallurgical company), who spoke out against sending weapons to the Zionist entity; and shopkeepers who closed their shops during the strikes in support of the mobilisation.

There were three main strikes: the one on 19 September called by the CGIL, the one on 22 September called by the USB and other grassroots unions, and the one on 3 October called jointly by the CGIL, the USB and the grassroots unions.

The first, lasting four hours (extended in many cases to eight hours), was a strike that excluded public sector workers because of the notice period, which violated the laws governing the right to strike in essential services. Participation was therefore mainly from the private sector and, more specifically, from metalworkers. The strike was well attended, although there were no particular moments of street demonstrations. The CGIL called for the strike a few days before the grassroots unions, attempting to place itself at the head of the movement in order to lead and control it, but it failed miserably in this objective.

The strike on 22 September, called by the grassroots unions, was, on the other hand, a major general strike in which all those who had been unable to strike on the 19th took part and, in many cases, even those who had demonstrated on both dates. On that day, the squares were filled and it was clear that the mobilisation was growing, both in quantity and quality.

Given the failure of the 19th, the CGIL, for the first time in its history, called a strike on 3 October together with the grassroots unions. This event, which was one of a kind rather than merely uncommon, was the result of the mass mobilisation of workers, which succeeded in eliminating trade union opportunism and sectarianism and forced all unions, including the grassroots ones, to call for a single date for mobilisation. Thus, after many years of strikes rendered powerless by the opportunistic and compromising management of the confederal unions, or ultra-minority strikes promoted by the sectarian dynamics of the grassroots unions, 3 October saw a genuine general strike, with much of the country blocked and millions of people on the streets.

3) These political strikes in Italy, are unprecedented for the rest of Europe. What role did the communist and anti-imperialist movement play in the movement for Palestine in Italy?

In Italy, the ‘political strike’ – or let's say on general issues that go beyond purely economic and contractual issues – is not unprecedented. It is part of the history of the Italian labour movement: from those of 1943, which contributed to the fall of fascism, to the most recent one against the war in Iraq in 2003, called at the time by the confederal trade unions (CGIL, CISL and UIL together). It is a tradition that has its origins in the hegemony and deep roots of the communist presence within trade union organisations and the working class. Even today, the most advanced sections of the working class are aware that specific issues, such as wages, taxation and the welfare state, can only be addressed in conjunction with general issues: the struggle against the tendency towards war, against the bourgeois system, etc.

The attempt to reduce the trade union—primarily the confederal union, and more specifically the CGIL—to a mere actor in the buying and selling of labour is constrained by the decline in trade union bargaining power, the hardening of employers’ positions during the current crisis, and the collapse of the illusion of concerted action. Furthermore, the fragmentation of production relations and, consequently, of the working class, forces union leaders to raise general issues as opportunities to consolidate their base. Added to

this is the fact that the end of the large social-democratic political organisations has led the union to take on the organisational function of the former parties. This is why, in Italy, trade unions also act on general issues, with obviously different lines and results. Grassroots unions also fulfil the same function, each dominated by political groups or sets of subjective forces that refer to the extra-parliamentary left and use the union as their own popular base.

The role of the communist movement, or at least the role we have tried to play, has been to link the mobilisation in solidarity with the Palestinian people to the struggle against the trend towards war and the state of war, identifying our imperialism and its government as the enemies to be fought. With this in mind, we emphasised class and mass unity by taking to the streets with the main message of support for the Resistance. We also pursued the goal of countering the bourgeois left's attempt to make distinctions and criminalise the armed struggle of the Palestinian people, by making the Palestinian cause an exclusively humanitarian issue. However, we never opposed the humanitarian content, but tried to emphasise that the only way for the Palestinian people to fight against genocide is, in reality, the struggle for liberation. This mass line proved to be correct and in tune with the feelings of the masses who took part in defiance of the bans and police charges.

4) Migratory flows have been crossing Italy for several years now. How significant has the role of second-generation migrants been in the mobilisations?

The role of young people of Arab and African origin has been very important. For the first time, these young people have taken to the streets and been the protagonists of a process of mobilisation in our country. Many of them found in the Palestinian question a space in which to assert themselves. It is worth highlighting in particular the role of the young women we met in the assemblies and demonstrations as leaders and vanguards of the mobilisation. The government fears the emergence of these sectors of youth and, more generally, of young people. Indeed, repression is currently focused mainly on them. For example, after the demonstration on 22 September in Milan, among the various people arrested for the assault on the central station, only two of the minors arrested were transferred to a juvenile prison. There are many other such examples.

In particular, the government is trying to stir up reactionary mobilisation against second-generation young people by criminalising them, portraying them as thugs and gangs, and trying to promote a campaign on urban security that singles them out. Racial profiling is a characteristic feature of the Italian police force, which always keeps a close eye on and harasses those with darker skin, even committing state murders such as that of Ramy Elgaml in Milan on 24 November 2024. Neo-fascist groups also join in the institutional persecution by attacking occupied schools and attempting to organise patrols against young immigrants.

It is also for this reason that solidarity with the Palestinian resistance has catalysed the discontent of second-generation proletarians: anger at their own living conditions has become linked to anger at Zionist crimes. Participation in the struggle against the oppression of the Palestinians has become a moment of reaction to the oppression suffered here in their own flesh.

5) The logic of reformism (and sectors we call the 'leftist of NATO') to divide the 'good' from the 'bad', the 'peaceful' from the 'violent' has been a constant feature. What has been the response to this attitude and how has the movement reacted to it?

The situation in Palestine has opened up contradictions within the Italian ruling class between the line of the government, essentially close to Netanyahu and the Zionist right, and the line of the bourgeois left in opposition, which challenges the actions of the current Tel Aviv government uniquely for electoral purposes, as the Zionists have shown

their inability to normalise the occupation of Palestine. There has been no stance against Zionism, on the contrary, there has been a desire to assert ‘good Zionism’ against ‘bad Zionism’. In any case, these contradictions within the ruling class have opened up additional space for mobilisation.

The forces of the bourgeois left (ie. the opposition in parliament) have been pulled along by this mobilisation, in an attempt to use it against the government – It suffices to note that some that some MEPs from the Democratic Party were on the flotilla – but they have failed to either lead or control the mobilisation. The role played by these organisations is now well known to all, and they have often been challenged in the streets. It is worth noting that in the last regional elections, these forces did not see any growth in votes, with abstentions being the only figures to rise.

During the mobilisation, the government and the mainstream media attempted to denounce the ‘violence’ of the demonstrations, but the actions had such legitimacy and mass determination that even they found it difficult to reproduce the logic of good guys vs. bad guys. Even those within the movement who attempted this so found themselves isolated. No one could say that it was ‘wrong’ to occupy the station or the port, and the determination and actions that led to the blockades, even when they resulted in clashes with the police, were seen by the vast majority as the consequence of the objective that had been set with the slogan ‘Let's block everything’.

6) The Meloni government, a centre-right government, is often described by sectors of the left wing movement in France as fascist, while the French right has coined the term “to Meloni-ize” to refer to right-wing opportunism (accused of softening her stance on migration, EU skepticism, fiscal spending, and foreign policy toward Ukraine after taking power). What role has the current Meloni government played in the polarisation that has arisen in Italy over the Palestinian question?

Giorgia Meloni's party has its historical roots in the MSI, the fascist force that, after the victory of the anti-fascist Resistance in World War II, reorganized itself to participate in the political life of the so-called democratic republic. Its ideological foundations and political references are drawn from the twenty-year legacy of Mussolini's regime. This marks a clear break with the forces that previously governed Italy, for which anti-fascism —at least in its bourgeois form—remained a guiding reference, if only superficially.

From the standpoint of government action, however, the current administration is remarkably consistent with its predecessors. It continues the Draghi government’s programme, which, while not entirely abandoned at the time, gave way to a post-fascist government with a strong right-wing parliamentary majority, better positioned to pursue a state of war both abroad and at home. The main thrusts remain unchanged: austerity, reductions in public spending, wage freezes, and the channeling of resources toward employers—today increasingly directed to the military-industrial complex and war. It is no coincidence that both Mario Draghi and Brussels have repeatedly applauded Meloni. It should be noted that since taking office, this government has always shown strong cohesion and an ability to handle criticism and attacks without being destabilised. However, recent mobilisations have had the power to weaken it and put it in difficulty.

Faced with the mass mobilisations that have taken place, the government has indeed had to officially change its attitude towards the situation in Palestine: by calling on the Zionists to show “moderation”; by considering the recognition of the Palestinian state, subject to the release of Zionist prisoners and the disarmament of the Resistance; by applauding Trump's ‘peace’ plan, also used as a card to deflate the movement. This formal change of attitude has not altered the substance of the partnership with the Zionist entity, nor has it led to any restriction on arms deliveries. The Meloni government has proved, in all respects, to be one of the main supporters of the Zionist entity, on a par

with the German government. The actions of these governments today highlight the deep divide between the interests of the financial oligarchy and the imperialist bourgeoisie and what the masses are expressing in the streets in support of the Palestinian Resistance. The ruling classes are Zionist, the masses are for Palestine. We must be grateful to the Palestinian resistance for clearly showing the masses in our country, as well as those around the world, who the common enemy is. The
fact that the Meloni government has taken no measures to break with the Zionist entity will allow us to continue our mobilisation and to identify more and more clearly in our imperialism, and in its network of interests and relations, the enemy to be fought. By linking the general demands against the Zionist occupation and against imperialist war to the struggles against the deterioration of the working and living conditions of the masses in factories, schools and neighbourhoods.

Lenin and the national question: What strategy in Corsica on the question of national liberation struggles

Marxism-Leninism requires that, in order to analyse the problem of national oppression, like any other social problem, it must be placed in its concrete historical context and that account must be taken both of the concrete particularities of the national movements of oppressed nations and of the conditions of the communist and revolutionary movement at the international level in the concrete historical epoch.

This implies, first of all, that a clear distinction must be made between two distinct periods of capitalism. On the one hand, there is the period of rising capitalism, of the bourgeoisie's struggle against feudalism and absolutism. At this time, nations were forming in the modern sense of the term, mass national movements were emerging for the first time, and nation states were being created. This responded to the bourgeoisie's need to establish and define its market and lay the foundations for independent, modern capitalist development.

On the contrary, the imperialist era is one of capitalist decline. In this era, the bourgeois-democratic revolution had already been accomplished in all the countries that have been imperialist. However, this did not mean that the national question and the struggle for democratic political guarantees disappeared.

The national liberation movements in Corsica, Ireland, the Basque Country, Catalonia, etc., which are developing today in the midst of the imperialist era, within imperialist countries and on the behalf of oppressed nations (that already have advanced capitalist economies and a large working class), do not fall under the category of understanding of 'the national question during the ascendant era of capitalism', but rather the national question under imperialism. This is the struggle for the right to self-determination of nations which imperialist states keep under subjugation against their will.

These considerations show us how to situate the case of the current national liberation movements within the imperialist metropolises, where no bourgeois-democratic revolution is on the agenda. The clearest guidance for answering this question is given by Lenin in his work ‘On a Caricature of Marxism and “Imperialist Economism”’ (1916) and in other writings from the same period. In these texts, Lenin criticises Pyatakov, Bukharin and other Russian Social Democrats who argued that, in the imperialist era, the struggle for democracy and the slogan of the right to self-determination no longer made sense and claimed that democracy and self-determination were now

unachievable.

This conception was ideologically analogous to that defended by the 'economists' between 1894 and 1902 and had already been supported, in various forms and nuances, between 1903 and 1913 by Russian opportunists (Gvozdiev, Martov and Cheidze) who continued to defend it during the war. Political tendency during the period of 1894-1902 amongst Russian '*Economists*' 1902 was that workers should refrain from political struggle, justifying this with arguments based on economic relations. In essence, they had a mistaken conception of the relationship between the political movement and the economic movement of society; they had a schematic, deterministic and unidirectional conception of it.

According to Lenin, the assertion that the right of nations to self-determination is unachievable within the limits of capitalism can be interpreted in an absolute sense, as 'economically impossible' (i.e., incompatible with the economic order), or in a relative sense, as 'politically impossible' (i.e., contrary to the dominant political orientation). In the first case, this assertion is radically false, even from a theoretical point of view. The domination of finance capital, like that of capital in general, cannot be abolished by any transformation in the realm of political democracy – the realm to which the right to self-determination belongs entirely and exclusively – but only by the revolutionary break with the current class relations, which is an indispensable condition for putting an end to all forms of national oppression once and for all.

Consequently, Lenin argues, any argument about the economic infeasibility of one of the demands of political democracy under capitalism is nothing more than a theoretically inaccurate definition of the general and fundamental relations between capitalism and political democracy in general. From a political point of view, the assertion of impossibility is inaccurate and partial because, according to Lenin, not only the right of nations to self-determination, but also all the fundamental demands of political democracy are 'realizable' even within the framework of imperialism, but in an incomplete, distorted form and as a rare exception (for example, when Norway separated from Sweden in 1905).

It is in this context that Lenin develops the concept of "democracy" as the best cover for imperialism.

While recognising that these democratic demands are difficult to achieve for political reasons or that they are unachievable without a series of revolutions, Lenin does not conclude that the revolutionary left should give up the immediate and resolute struggle for all these demands, including the right to self-determination. In his view, such a renunciation would only benefit the

bourgeoisie and the reactionaries. On the contrary, he argued for the need to formulate and put these demands into practice, not in a reformist manner but in a revolutionary one; not to allow oneself to be confined within the framework of bourgeois legality, but to break it; not to limit oneself to parliamentary interventions and verbal protests, but to draw the masses into active struggle, broadening and reviving the struggle for each fundamental democratic demand until the proletariat launches a direct attack on the bourgeoisie, that is, until the socialist revolution that expropriates the bourgeoisie.

With this, Lenin wants to make it clear that all these demands, although difficult to achieve within the framework of imperialism, and although limited and precarious, remain nevertheless possible to achieve through revolutionary struggle. The case of Norway's separation from Sweden, achieved ‘without war and without revolution’ and made possible by the firm internationalist position of the Swedish workers and by the international imperialist situation (Britain, Russia and Germany were all interested in Norwegian independence), is, according to Lenin, ‘a rare exception’.

Lenin also pointed out that the demand for the immediate liberation of the colonies, formulated at the time by the entire revolutionary left, was "unrealizable under capitalism without a series of revolutions ". This was fully confirmed by the fact that it was the October Revolution that gave impetus to the anti-colonial struggle and that, a few years later, the victory of the USSR over Nazi-fascism, the Chinese revolution and the formation of the socialist camp changed the global balance of power in favour of revolution and the national liberation struggle. Despite this, the colonial countries had to take up arms and, in most cases, wage a bloody and hard struggle against imperialism.

Lenin's views clearly contradict the theses of those who consider the struggle of a nation oppressed by an imperialist state for the right to self-determination to be anachronistic in Europe. They also contradict the arguments of those who consider it impossible or are sceptical about the possibility of a small, oppressed nation breaking away from the state and separating from the nation that oppresses it. For Lenin, the key to turning this possibility into reality lies in the struggle of the oppressed people for this right.

We do not support movements that seek to further isolate parts of the population from each other by playing on historically inherited differences in culture, customs, religion, language, level of development, type of activity, etc. On the contrary, we support any initiative that enables and facilitates a free and voluntary rapprochement between different sections of the population, their mutual understanding and further integration, so that, on the basis of their direct experience, they can break down the prejudices that divide them, and freely create relationships of coexistence and collaboration on a

basis of total willingness and absolute equality.

This objective is consistent with and promotes the maximum development of the productive and creative material and spiritual forces of people in all countries, and in practice it can only be fully and sustainably achieved by overcoming capitalist relations of production, which by their nature set individuals, social groups and countries in opposition and competition with each other and make their respective legitimate interests antagonistic. In general, in order to achieve this, where we inherit from history ties that have been imposed and maintained by force or deception, these relations must first be dissolved so that new relations can then be built freely and voluntarily.

This Marxist-Leninist position distinguishes us from dogmatists and opportunists who see the recognition of the right of oppressed nations to self-determination, i.e. the right to secession, as something contrary to proletarian internationalism and socialist revolution. But it also distinguishes us from petty-bourgeois nationalism, which conceives of the right to self-determination as a simple recognition of the equal rights of all nations, while ensuring national egoism remains intact.

On the contrary, proletarian internationalism demands:

a) The subordination of the interests of the proletarian struggle in one country to the interests of the proletarian struggle on a global scale;

b) That the nation that triumphs over its bourgeoisie be capable and willing to make the greatest national sacrifices to overthrow capitalism on an international scale. In other words, for communists, the interests of democracy in one country must be subordinated to the advancement of the socialist revolution in one or more countries, or on a global scale.

On the other hand, Lenin's conception of the struggle for democracy in general in imperialist countries, which he expounds in his discourse on the right of oppressed nations to self-determination, also categorically refutes those who opportunistically underestimate, deny or distort, by various subterfuges, the possibility that the popular masses, whether under a regime of preventive counter-revolution or an openly fascist regime, may impose on the imperialist bourgeoisie, through struggle, this or that democratic demand, even temporarily, with limited and precarious results.

All ‘democracy’, Lenin emphasises, consists in the proclamation and realisation of ‘rights’ which, under capitalism, are only achievable to a very limited extent and in a very relative form; but without this proclamation, without the struggle for these rights being waged now and without hesitation, without the masses being educated in the necessity of such struggles,

socialism is impossible.

That is why we must, even in the imperialist countries, support and lead the struggle for democracy, however ‘incomplete and distorted’ it may be, and, consequently, in particular, support the right of oppressed nations to secession, in order to promote the socialist revolution. Without a truly democratic organisation of relations between nations and, therefore, without the freedom to form a separate state, it is impossible to overthrow the imperialist bourgeoisie of a given country and establish socialism.

In the struggle for socialism that the working and popular masses must wage against the imperialist bourgeoisie, the struggle for political democracy is not only possible but also inevitable and necessary (a central battle in the French imperialist context is that against Islamophobia), even though imperialism tends towards the most unbridled political reaction.

The socialist revolution in the European imperialist states, given the multiplicity of interests, both internal and international, that are at stake, the absence of a socialist camp and the exacerbation of imperialist contradictions, does not have a linear course and will not be carried out solely by the working class.

That is why, now more than ever, Lenin's conclusion in 1916 is relevant: "The socialist revolution in Europe can only be an explosion of the mass struggle of all and each of the oppressed and discontented sectors. The petty bourgeoisie and the backward workers will necessarily take part in it – without their participation, no mass struggle is possible, no revolution is possible. They will bring into the movement, this too is inevitable, their prejudices, their reactionary fantasies, their weaknesses and their errors. But objectively, they will attack capital. The conscious vanguard of the revolution, the advanced proletariat, expressing this objective truth of the struggle of masses that are apparently distinct and whose slogans are varied and seemingly unconnected, will be able to unify and lead them, seize power, take over the banks, expropriate the trusts hated by all (albeit for different reasons!) and implement other dictatorial measures which, taken together, constitute the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the victory of socialism, a victory which will not be able to immediately get rid of the petty-bourgeois dross. "

The struggle for the right to self-determination and equal rights for nations is, as Lenin said, part of the struggle for democracy and constitutes the best school for the proletarian class to lead the masses towards the overthrow of the capitalist state, educate them in the most consistent democracy and build socialism.

When there are independent national forces promoting the struggle to assert

the right to self-determination, in accordance with a widespread aspiration that has manifested itself in various ways and on various occasions over a long period of time, communists must integrate themselves organically into these projects and be capable, in line with their tendencies, of placing themselves at their head. By focusing their action on the specific interests of our class, the modern urban proletariat without reservation, but at the same time, capable of bringing together broader forces.

This is the challenge facing us today in the imperialist metropolises. To achieve this, it is essential that the forces of the proletarian left find an independent plan of action and organisation, capable of promoting a politically and socially appropriate strategy and tactics to be deployed within the liberation movements in the struggle against imperialism. An example that we in Europe consider to be moving in this direction is that of the Basques (Bultza Ehm-l, Euskal Herriko Marxista-Leninista)15, where the communists' struggle for independence (the construction of a proletarian left organisation) is combined with the national liberation struggle led by the popular forces.

Corsica

Corsica is experiencing the astonishing paradox of being led for the first time in its modern history by a large nationalist majority, while facing a historic renunciation of the National Liberation Struggle. As elsewhere, even more so than in the Basque Country or Catalonia, where the cowardice of the national bourgeoisie is inversely proportional to their economic power, the nationalist majority has abandoned the national project on the threshold of power.

After nine years in power, and despite a local assembly where so-called nationalist organisations represent 68% of the assembly, where the ruling party has an absolute majority of seats, it can be said that it has achieved virtually nothing.

Far from the referendum route taken in Kanaky, dual nationality or the British devolution of the Scottish and Northern Irish states without a nation, Corsica has achieved literally nothing. The minimal demands, commonly and consensually accepted on the island under pressure from the most right-wing wing of the National Movement, are still not on the agenda: to this day, the Corsican language does not officially exist, it is not compulsory in schools, the Corsican people have no existence or elections of their own, and there is no legislative power, no police, no justice system and, of course, no army.

Of all the islands in the Mediterranean, Corsica is the only one that does not have a formal autonomous status.

This lack of status, beyond what it reveals about France, also reveals why

communists must fly the Corsican flag. It is not just a moral issue, but rather the task of revolutionaries at a time of French rearmament in the face of the decline of French imperialism.

The national aspiration in Corsica is not just a desirable thorn in France's side. Corsica, in addition to being an island of non-French culture, is “una nazione vinta ch'hà da rinasce”, as the magazine A Cispra put it in 1914. It was an independent country born of a revolution when it was brutally invaded by France in 1768. It had a national administration, only to become a military outpost for French interests in the Mediterranean. Hunted down by soldiers and thugs in uniform, underdeveloped, its population found salvation only in economic exile, integration into the French administration (mainly sovereign) and extensive participation in colonial enterprises in Africa and Asia, punctuated by the exchange of Corsican blood for war pensions.

A territory endowed with a little of everything but unsuitable for major mining ventures, it was generally spared from internal colonialism due to the lack of interest from large French companies, although there were a few notable attempts (projects to ‘regenerate the race’ under the old regime, settlement colonies, the establishment of 40,000 pieds-noirs in the territory, and the plundering of the plains in the 1960s). The result is the absence of a bourgeoisie of large metropolitan landowners and segregationists.

After the failure of the pieds-noirs settlement, Corsica's economy has therefore turned mainly to tourism, which accounts for 39% of the island's GDP. This economy is fragile, seasonal and unstable, but above all, like any economy established in Corsica, it is filtered through the prism of a clan-based society and very small businesses.

The other important sector, public services and administration (37% of employment), maintains transport and health services in a region where the majority of new arrivals from mainland France (pinzuti) are elderly. The population, which is fairly stable, is swelled by the arrival of nearly 4,000 pinzuti each year, contributing to the precariousness of the labour market in a region where wages are among the lowest in France, prices are the highest, and the price of land per square metre is the highest after the Ile de France.

As a result of this situation, Corsica remains a fragmented territory with many landowners, whose integration into the French economy has taken place over the last 50 years through and for French tourism. Everything about it is absurd: the island has four airports and six international ports, but found itself cut off from Sardinia, just 13 km away, for an entire winter. The very negative trade balance reveals the weakness of trade with Italy, which remains the island's natural neighbour.

The Corsican bourgeoisie, which was unable to form locally during the positive phase of capitalist development in Europe, is doing so in the current phase, its role immediately becoming parasitic. It has built up important networks in international trade between France and its African colonies (military sales intermediaries, infrastructure, cocaine), while in Corsica it lives off speculation on land and property.

Multinationals have largely lost interest in the territory, apart from a few rare and rather revealing occasions, such as the agreement between the French State and the Italian company Montedison to dump hazardous industrial waste on the Corsican coast in the 1970s.

This, in a nutshell, is what France had to offer Corsica: to be a periphery of an empire in decline, while jobs in the colonies were becoming increasingly scarce.

It was in this backward society that the Corsican National Liberation Movement was born. From the 'Beirut Declaration' to armed organisations, it is intrinsically linked to the history of anti-colonial struggles and waves of anti-imperialist struggles in France. From the organisation to the very name of the armed wing, through to its political targets, it was born out of the defeats of the French Empire, grew out of the hopes of the Arab and Pan-African movements, and was gradually integrated by the failures of the struggles and repression.

The national solution responded to problems that Corsican society, with its archaic structures, could not face alone. In itself, national liberation is never an end in itself: it is the form taken by the class struggle in countries where imperialist control prevents the normal course of capital. Corsica is undergoing rapid modernisation of the anomalies linked to its peripheral status: the end of peasantry, the collapse of pastoralism, the polarisation of the population in two or three towns on the island, while 40% of houses are now second homes, and finally and above all, seasonality, which involves the massive use of a seasonal imported proletariat that does not reside on the island all year round.

Corsican nationalism, led by bourgeois autonomism, is unable to respond to these problems. Without the weapon of the nation, without the prospect of confrontation with imperialist power, it is weakening and seeing the paranoia of its own weakness grow within it: unwilling to admit its renunciations and boasting of its electoral victories, it opens its clientele to a 'Corsican' right wing that can only be French nationalist, imperialist, Zionist, in short, pro-American.

For us, there is no question of choosing sides between the two faces of this

same coin. Whether it is the ‘Corsican’ right or the autonomists, it is ultimately the path of integration into the French agenda that is taking shape. While the former takes the form of the most despicable reaction for reasons deeply rooted in the history of French Corsica – due to the convergence of Bolloré's interests in Africa with Corsican thuggery – the latter is now in power and collaborates with the French authorities.

No revolutionary activist in Corsica can avoid the national question. The activists whom the SDAT comes to arrest early in the morning are systematically those who have chosen to support or embrace the path of military struggle against the French state. Our tasks in Corsica are to restore the National Liberation Struggle and to reject a form of autonomism that no one really wants, neither the state nor the Corsican bourgeoisie. At a time when the French state is preparing for military confrontation and reducing funding for the infrastructure that sustains Corsica, and when the peoples of Africa are striking blow after blow against Françafrique, it is time to resume the path of emancipation for the Corsican republic.

Proletarian Investigation: The Bel Ombre Residence - A story of Cooperation and Resistance in Marseille

This investigation was made possible thanks to the work of our comrades at the Collectif des Chômeurs Précaires of Soldiaires 13 (the precarious workers and unemployed section of the local union) and the Local Ghassan Kanafani in Marseille. The aim of this investigation is neither sociological nor journalistic. What interests us is resistance and popular organisation, that is, the concrete expression of proletarian autonomy.

The Belle Ombre residence is located in the southern districts of Marseille, along the Huveaune Valley, in an urban setting typical of the southern districts: next to small terraced houses, there are huge residential tower blocks.

This area is the subject of an urban redevelopment programme aimed at making the banks of the stream pedestrianised, building a cycle path, etc.

Land in this area is increasing in value and various property speculators and institutions are taking an interest in it.

The presence of buildings of this type therefore disrupts potential property speculation, and there is a desire to speed up their demolition and/or 'redevelopment' in order to turn them into flats for a more affluent social sector. This mechanism is currently at work in several neighbourhoods of Marseille and corresponds to the typical mechanism of 'gentrification', i.e. the displacement of working-class neighbourhoods further and further away from the commercial and financial centre of the city. Working-class neighbourhoods can only come to city centres to work or shop. Even the purchase of housing is increasingly relegated far from the city centre for working-class neighbourhoods.

This condominium, the Belle Ombre residence, comprises more than 250 flats occupied by owners and tenants who pay rents at free market prices.

This model of co-ownership has been used several times in Marseille. These are therefore huge co-owned properties, with high costs associated with central heating, the presence of lifts as some towers are over 10 storeys high, which often means the presence of gardiens, and very large communal areas, which require maintenance.

All these types of co-ownerships in Marseille, intended for low- to middle-income social classes, have led most tenants and 'owners' to incur huge debts due to high management and maintenance costs.

Belle Ombre, like dozens of other residences in Marseille, finds itself with a huge debt linked to co-ownership charges exceeding €1 million. At the same time, the building's structure is in an advanced state of disrepair. A whole series of elements are no longer functioning. This is the case, for example, with the lifts, which creates a great deal of inconvenience for elderly or

disabled people, who find themselves unable to leave their homes because the lift is no longer working... Even the gate that closes off the residence is no longer working, and the list of malfunctions could go on. In October 2025, the lifts were still stuck, a lady was hospitalised and the fire brigade had to be called to lower her out of the window using ropes...

The final link in the chain of deterioration affecting many residences in Marseille's working-class neighbourhoods is the presence of drug dealers and racketeering. Drug dealing networks therefore attempted to set up shop inside the Belle Ombre residence as well, opening dealing points during the summer of 2025.

The difference, compared to other tower blocks, residences and co-owned properties in Marseille, is that the residents of Belle Ombre decided to react by organising a form of cooperation and self-defence. They set up patrols made up of the residents themselves to prevent drug dealer networks from setting up in the residence. As this form of popular self-defence developed, the news reached the general public through articles in the national press, Le Monde, Le Figaro, and on television, such as BFMTV.

These patrols were carried out by people who live in the neighbourhood, who know the neighbourhood, who have probably experienced first-hand the same difficulties and problems that young people, most of them minors, are going through today, as they are the ones who physically set up the dealing points for drug trafficking rackets. The patrols arrested the dealers and confiscated their drugs. The drugs were then handed over to the police, but without turning the dealer in. The approach was to talk to them, to explain that the money from trafficking, from the underworld, from all these people glorified by rap music, is self-destructive for them and their families, and that after a few years, the alternative is always the same: you start at 13 and by 20 you're dead or in prison (captured by the police and/or sold by the racketeers themselves).

For years, the institutions have remained silent, as is often the case with problems related to racketeering (drugs, prostitution, weapons), because they are directly complicit or deliberately distracted. They oscillate between profiting on several levels, from direct involvement to tolerance in order to calm the possible consequences of extreme and significant poverty in the city, to the fear generated by the gigantic problem of the Marseille drugs networks and their violence.

The prefecture (the central government’s local administrative office) reacted quickly by convening a meeting with these residents, congratulating them on their civic spirit, but reaffirming that it is not up to ordinary citizens to solve these problems. It is interesting to note that the patrols did not ask for more police officers. In the working-class neighbourhoods of Marseille, the role of the police is all too well known.

The prefecture and the police put pressure on the ‘politicians’ to intervene. We therefore have a reversal of the usual situation, where it is the politicians

who call on the police to intervene. It was clear that the patrols' ability to put an end to racketeering had demonstrated the ineffectiveness of the police and therefore of the state, highlighting the capacity for organisation and cooperation among the working classes. This is what we identify as the manifestation of proletarian autonomy, both from an organisational and a forward-looking perspective.

The patrols' battle against racketeering has put Belle Ombre in the spotlight, transforming a simple struggle for housing into a deeper, political issue that touches the veins and nerves of the city.

Meetings with the prefecture, demonstrations in front of the town hall and the court-appointed trustee, and meetings with other institutional figures have followed in recent months.

The residence is now under judicial administration: a judge appoints a co-ownership administrator who effectively deprives the owners of the possibility of intervening in decisions concerning their property.

A new stage in this process took place in November 2025: on 24 November, a ‘danger’ notice was to come into effect in order to facilitate the eviction of the residents. A demonstration was planned in front of the town hall about a week earlier. Coincidentally, the demonstration was scheduled for the same day as Darmanin's visit to the family of Amin Kessachi (a political representative of the Green Party) following the murder of his brother by racketeers, a fact that was the subject of national debate. On the eve of the demonstration, the Belle Ombre residents' committee was convened and obtained a six-month postponement of the endangerment order. The timing was obviously linked to Darmanin's presence and the umpteenth attempt to avoid highlighting the issue of drugs and racketeering in Marseille. And to hide this experiment in popular self-defence, which shows the complete failure of state policies.

Who are these ‘Martians’?

The majority of Belle Ombre's residents are of African origin, nearly 80%. The activists who created the committee and the patrols are residents or former residents who maintain ties because part of their family still lives there, because they have friends, etc. Many of them are connected to the neighbourhood mosque, and are therefore attentive to collective conditions based on principles of solidarity and mutual aid. Some of them are active in pro-Palestinian movements. This committee is a collective struggle that organises rallies in front of the prefecture, the town hall, and the Syndic (the body or company responsible for managing and maintaining the shared parts of an apartment building on behalf of all the owners.), and organises patrols, but it is also a committee that wants to re-establish links between residents by emphasising the collective dimension and solidarity. Those who have known the neighbourhood for years say they have seen the social context deteriorate. When they were children, some forty years ago, there were more social ties between residents, families looked after each other's children, the older ones tried to guide the younger ones towards a dignified life for themselves and for

others, there were different types of relationships, but over the years, this has been lost and people have become increasingly isolated in their individual lives. The role of this committee is therefore also to recreate links between different families, in particular through small parties and fun initiatives in the park below the housing complex. It is called Belle Ombre (Beautiful Shade) because there is a park with quite old, very beautiful trees that provide beautiful shade. The committee wants to open a room on the ground floor of the residence so that residents can play sports and engage in other cultural and social activities.

Many other residences are in the same situation. In recent months, a small network of tower blocks and co-owned properties has begun to form in Marseille. Other similar places are participating: Mazenode, Airbel, Felix Pyat, etc. Each residence has its own particularities; some consist mainly of social housing, others of private housing. The meetings aim to bring together the various committees (formal and informal), but it is clear that not all of them have the same approach.

For the moment, in the coordination meetings, the connecting point is poor housing, and the drug problem is frightening, not only because of the military weight of racketeering, but also because of the reactions of the institutions. Marseille is a city where the octopus has connections in all social and political structures, from the world of political parties to trade unions (all of them, without exception), including cultural and sports associations. There is a clientelist system based on 'donations' that allows the associative world to survive, and in many cases, it is even the octopus's own interface. Everyone knows, but no one speaks out, some out of fear, others out of self-interest, in the classic mafia tradition...

Within Bell Ombre's committee itself, those who wanted to focus on the fight against drugs were mainly the most popular sectors, linked to tenants, and not to the owners themselves (who are certainly 'owners', but linked to mortgages and banks), frightened by the problems that the fight against drug trafficking in Marseille inevitably generates.

The only activists who participated and showed solidarity with this fight were certain sectors of France Insoumise (which has a real presence in the working-class neighbourhoods of Marseille, with the direct participation of activists and militants from these neighbourhoods) and the collective of unemployed and precarious workers (from the Local Ghassan Kanafani in Marseille).

Conclusions

This story highlights the lack of institutional and political will to tackle the problem of drug trafficking in Marseille, and instead emphasises how it encourages property speculation and social degradation. In the case of Belle Ombre, there is a clear link between social degradation and property speculation. The very attempt by racketeers to set up sales outlets is in line with property speculation. The deterioration of buildings and the area significantly lowers the price per square metre and favours those who could

potentially buy the residence en bloc in order to renovate it and turn it into apartments whose price per square metre is tripled, quintupled or even increased tenfold. This is the same logic that governed the construction of these residences from the outset, designed according to the perverse parameters of capital, leading to their failure. The inability of the social class that had been identified as the one that would live in these buildings to meet the co-ownership charges could be anticipated from the outset of the project, as could the inability of small buyers, individuals purchasing a single flat.

This is a kind of real estate gigantism, which requires corresponding economic instruments and allows only large owners and property developers to 'control' renovation, or even demolition with a view to reconstruction. This is how we should interpret the tolerance with which, in many cases, institutions and sectors of the ruling classes welcome the presence and establishment of the rule of the drugs networks ie. the Marseille 'octopus'.

Marseille is a city that has always been marked by struggles and committees on the issue of housing, linked to the extreme social precariousness in the cité and residences, but in many cases there are links with institutions in the form of clientelist concessions, or even in some cases outright charity. Marseille is a sunny Mediterranean city where buildings collapse in the city centre "because of the rain"! think about what is happening in the working-class neighbourhoods.

The opposite trend created by the Belle Ombre residents' committee has been to address a problem related to housing that everyone hides and suffers from: racketeering, drug trafficking, the spread of drug-related deaths in our neighbourhoods (it should not be forgotten that this goes hand in hand with arms trafficking and, of course, prostitution, which today affects increasingly younger women). It is thanks to the fight against drug trafficking led by the residents of Belle Ombre that the institutions and the police have paid attention to housing demands and achieved partial victories. It is the struggle they have waged, the patrols, a genuine form of self-defence and popular cooperation, that have made this committee "healthy", but also more "dangerous" for the institutions in Marseille. There have been numerous attempts to bury this committee, and these will continue. Local institutions and police forces have no interest in this committee practising self-defence. They have been repeatedly asked to deal only with the issue of "real estate" according to the most basic trade union vision. Politics is not for the "people", it is for experts, for technicians, fundamentally for the bourgeoisie...

But it is precisely the fight against drug trafficking that has given strength to the struggle over the housing problem, and this is the most important lesson we can learn from this experience. The fight against drug trafficking is one aspect of the struggle of the inhabitants of Belle Ombre to recreate social ties, a collective dimension that this society and its imperialist culture are doing everything to destroy and erase among the popular masses. It would obviously be pointless to try to artificially reproduce such an experience, but it is clear

that it puts a different approach on the agenda and offers us a valid example of what it means to resist on the ground, combining struggle, cooperation, solidarity, self-defence and popular dignity.

The legacy of Sankara and Marxism in Africa

The protest movements in Africa in recent years have shaken the world. From the Sahel to Kenya, from Madagascar to Morocco, the question of the continent's revolutionary future is once again on the agenda. Amid countless forms and inconsistent expressions, common aspirations are emerging. The neocolonial status quo is cracking. The flag of anti-imperialist struggle has been raised across the most coveted continent, particularly with the end of France's military control over its former colonies. This is compounded by the decision of the juntas of Niger, Mali and Burkina Faso (united in the AES, Alliance of Sahel States) to withdraw from West Africa's main economic bloc (ECOWAS) on January 28 2024, describing the decision in a joint statement as a rejection of 'the influence of foreign powers' in "the spirit of Pan-Africanism ." The question of the sovereignty of African states, genuine self-determination, and the struggle to break free from French neocolonialism and, more broadly, from the imperialist order, has once again been raised. What will emerge from the historic ruptures currently underway in the 'sub-region' is not yet clearly defined. Yet after years of lethargy and illusions surrounding 'imported democracy' and the preservation of the neocolonial status quo, the contradictions within the African bourgeoisies and the movement of the popular masses are now imposing a new situation. The dismantling of Françafrique opens the doors to the future, even if at present a programme for socialism, the only guarantee of real independence, is not being pursued by the subjective forces that lead the mass movements and states. It has therefore become essential for all internationalist movements to take a position on the AES, but also to draw on the real revolutionary experiences of previous decades in Africa, whose lessons can be used to give birth to and guide a new revolutionary path. The stakes are crucial for the African peoples, for the popular masses who are seeking a path to their liberation. The stakes are also decisive for the proletariat of Europe if it finally wants to detoxify itself from the imperialist ideology that is powerfully ingrained in its mind. In 1970, having outgrown his belief in a united Africa under capitalism Kwame Nkrumah, the first president of independent Ghana, adopted a Marxist-Leninist conception. He wrote that "In Africa, Asia and Latin America, the economic, political and social turmoil must be explained in the context of the world socialist revolution. For today, the revolutionary process brings together three currents: the world socialist system, the liberation movements of the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America, and the labour movements of the industrialised capitalist countries." The real and profound decline of these three currents should not obscure the fact that only the maintenance of Nkrumah's vision can chart a path to liberation for oppressed peoples. It is in the light of this conception, updated by current configurations, that Supernova magazine attempts to understand the course of events. Following an initial article in the journal on Sankara and revolutionary Pan-Africanism, we

propose here to revisit the experience of the 1983-1987 revolution in Burkina Faso, and then to place it in the broader context of socialist experiences and African Marxist developments. Finally, we will return to the need to defend the current experience of the AES, which was born on 16 September 2023.

1. The experiences of the Burkinabe revolution of 1983-1987
2. Socialist experiences and revolutionary nationalism
3. The AES today

The Experiences of the Burkinabe Revolution of 1983-1987

Sankara and the Burkinabe revolution of 1983-1987 are evoked and claimed by all anti-imperialist African youth. This is not surprising.

The 1983-1987 revolution and its main leader represented a historical counter-trend, like an isolated star in the neocolonial night. After the revolutionary wave that swept Africa in the 1960s (for most African countries) and 1970s (for the so-called Lusophone countries or Zimbabwe), the continent had largely fallen back into the neocolonial night, with African financial and economic policy once again being decided abroad, by the IMF and the World Bank and by the desire of the African bourgeoisie to integrate into capitalist globalisation. Going against the tide, the explicit goal of the Burkinabe revolution was to build an independent, self-sufficient and planned economy. The French bourgeoisie and its comprador relays in Burkina Faso were therefore bound to lose control over resources, trade, finance and the state. The steps taken in this direction are the main achievements of this revolutionary experience. In order to understand the general political orientation of the Burkinabe revolution, it is useful to recall the main thrust of the speeches of its principal leader. Sankara was influenced by several sources, including liberation theology, the writings and achievements of Lenin and Mao, and the African revolutionary movement of Nkrumah and Amilcar Cabral. His orientation was thus anti-imperialist and Marxist in inspiration.

This is how Sankara expressed himself shortly before his assassination: "As long as there is revolution, there will be reaction, there will be counter-revolution. And opposition to the revolution will take many forms and enjoy many kinds of support. The first enemy of the revolution is imperialism at work. I cannot tell you that we have definitively eliminated all risk. Imperialism may try to do something at any time. It will try to rely on this or that person who is against the revolution, outside or inside Burkina Faso. The only guarantee we can have is the people organising themselves to defend themselves, to defeat imperialism" (Sidwaya, 4 August 1987). Sankara based

his political line on Marxism and class struggle. In his Political Orientation Speech (DOP), he identified the enemies of the revolution as members of the state bourgeoisie who enrich themselves illegally, the commercial bourgeoisie with its thousand ties to imperialism, and the retrograde feudal forces that drew their social strength from traditional structures that exploited the decadent values present in the negative aspects of traditional culture. On the contrary, the peasant masses organised into cooperatives and those left behind by the neocolonial order are the driving forces of the Burkinabe revolution. Sankara was a staunch internationalist, as shown by his speech to the UN on 12 October 1984: "(...) It is necessary, it is urgent that our executives and our writers learn that there is no such thing as innocent writing. In these stormy times, we cannot leave the monopoly of thought, imagination and creativity to our enemies of yesterday and today alone. Before it is too late – for it is already late – these elites, these men of Africa, of the Third World, must come to their senses – that is to say, to their society, to the misery we have inherited – to understand not only that the battle for a way of thinking that serves the dispossessed masses is not in vain, but that they can only become credible on the international stage by truly innovating, that is, by presenting a true image of their peoples, an image that will enable them to bring about profound changes in the social and political situation, capable of freeing us from foreign domination and exploitation, which leave our states with no prospect other than bankruptcy.

This is what we, the people of Burkina Faso, have realised (...). We had to give meaning to the rumblings of revolt among the urban masses, who were unemployed, frustrated and tired of seeing the limousines of the alienated elites who succeeded one another at the head of the state and offered them nothing but false solutions thought up and designed by the minds of others. We had to give an ideological soul to the just struggles of our popular masses mobilised against monstrous imperialism. (...) We would like our words to reach out to all those who suffer in their flesh. All those whose dignity is trampled on by a minority of men or by a system that crushes them. (...) I speak not only on behalf of my beloved Burkina Faso, but also on behalf of all those who are suffering somewhere. I speak on behalf of those millions of people who live in ghettos because they have black skin or belong to different cultures, and who enjoy a status barely superior to that of animals. (...) I speak out on behalf of the unemployed in a structurally unjust and economically unstable system, reduced to seeing life only as a reflection of that of the more fortunate. I speak on behalf of women around the world who suffer from a system of exploitation imposed by men. As far as we are concerned, we are open to suggestions from around the world that will enable us to achieve the full development of Burkinabe women. In return, we will share with all countries the positive experience we are undertaking with women who are now present at all levels of the state apparatus and social life in Burkina Faso. (...) Only struggle brings freedom, and we call on all our sisters of all races to

rise up and fight for their rights. I speak on behalf of the mothers of our impoverished countries who see their children die of malaria or diarrhoea, unaware that there are simple ways to save them that multinational corporations do not offer them, preferring to invest in cosmetics laboratories and cosmetic surgery for the whims of a few women or men whose vanity is threatened by the excess calories in their overly rich meals. (...) I also speak on behalf of children. The children of the poor who are hungry and who glance furtively at the abundance piled up in a shop for the rich. (...) I speak on behalf of artists – poets, painters, sculptors, musicians, actors – good people who see their art prostituted for the alchemy of show business sleight of hand. I cry out on behalf of journalists who are reduced to either silence or lies in order to avoid the harsh laws of unemployment. I protest on behalf of athletes around the world whose muscles are exploited by political systems or modern slave traders. (...) My thoughts go out to all those affected by the destruction of nature and to the thirty million people who will die, as they do every year, struck down by the formidable weapon of hunger. As a soldier, I cannot forget that soldier obeying orders, his finger on the trigger, knowing that the bullet that will be fired carries only the message of death. (…) Our revolution in Burkina Faso is open to the misfortunes of all peoples. It is also inspired by all the experiences of mankind since the first breath of humanity. We want to be the heirs of all the revolutions of the world, of all the liberation struggles of the peoples of the Third World. (…) Open to all the winds of the will of peoples and their revolutions, learning also from certain terrible failures that have led to tragic human rights violations, we want to retain from each revolution only the core of purity that prevents us from becoming subservient to the realities of others, even if in our thinking we find ourselves in a community of interests. (…) There can be no more deception. The new world economic order for which we are fighting and will continue to fight can only be achieved if we succeed in destroying the old order that ignores us, if we impose our rightful place in the political organisation of the world, if, realising our importance in the world, we obtain a right of scrutiny and decision-making over the mechanisms that govern trade, the economy and currency on a global scale."

Sankara was a tribune of the people, with extraordinary qualities as a revolutionary leader. We know that this type of leader, described precisely in Lenin's What Is To Be Done?, does not arise spontaneously or from individual genius.

A whole series of struggles, power relations and political formations made his emergence possible. Sankara was the heir to the African revolutionary currents that arose in the crucible of anti-colonial struggles and attempts to adapt the universal truth of Marxism to the concrete conditions of African social formations. He was also the inspiration behind the Popular Development Programme launched on 1 October 1984. Any anti-imperialist

programme only makes sense if it is embodied in effective changes in social relations and if it enables a break from the slavery of dependence on imperialist centres, capitalist lenders and the stranglehold of the African big bourgeoisie. The objective of the 1984 Popular Programme was to win over the peasant and urban masses to the ideals of the revolution. The aim was to instil the principle of 'relying on one's own strength' so that the battle for economic independence would also be one that nurtured the self-confidence of the popular masses. From the outset, the perspective was that of Africa as a whole. The programme was intended to serve as an example for the entire continent. The principle was to refuse corruptive loans to the Burkinabe social elite and to minimise predatory investments by multinationals from imperialist centres. The projects of the CNR (National Council of the Revolution) are large-scale projects that must involve the widest possible popular initiative and participation. First and foremost is the 'Battle of Sourou' launched on 26 April 1984, i.e. the construction of a dam on the Mouhoun River to irrigate 23,370 hectares, accounting for more than 20% of the national cereal harvest. Breaking out of food dependency and lifting the peasant masses out of poverty cannot be achieved without challenging the conditions of land ownership. Local capitalists can effectively seize it, as can Sofitex (a company formed with public and foreign capital). This touches on a structural limitation: if cooperative farmers go into debt with private or semi-public funds such as those of Sofitex, the irrigation project will not lead to a change in the balance of power and class structure. Another major dam project began on 8 June 1985. This was the Kombienga hydroelectric dam, currently the second largest dam in the country. Its purpose was to supply electricity to the capital Ouagadougou with an average annual production of 50 GWh.

The project was only successful with the help of foreign funding, with Voith Thysen supplying the turbines. The desire for independence, as we can see, faces challenges that are those of building a national industrial economy. The 'Battle of the Rail' was another famous project during the years 1985-1987. The aim was to build a railway line between Ouagadougou and Tombao to transport manganese. At the time, Burkina Faso's economy was based on trade, that of the Sahel's minerals and livestock in exchange for cereals, fodder and manufactured goods. These three projects were included in the 1986 Five-Year Plan. The key message of this plan was to change people's lives through autonomous production efforts: building wells, pharmacies, schools, clinics and shops in each district. Foreign "aid" should no longer be the primary driver. Stadiums and shops (such as those in Faso Yaar) should be the work of the Burkinabe people themselves. Economic self-sufficiency, which we have seen is difficult to achieve in the short term, requires broadening and mobilising the social base through collective organisation. Sankara was accused of insisting on voluntarism, self-sacrifice and a sense of collective sacrifice rather than a rational industrial policy. These grievances may be

partially justified, but it is impossible to break out of economic dependence without instilling a powerful spirit of initiative and changing mindsets. Sankara's plebeian tendency to pit the peasant masses against urban workers and civil servants, from whom he demanded financial sacrifices, can be explained by this moral dimension, without which there can be no grand project of transformation of the popular masses by themselves. The participation of the working and exploited classes in economic affairs and the management of the state is a principle that truly animated the years of the Burkinabe revolution. In many regions, the CDRs (Committees for the Defence of the Revolution) were a genuine expression of the will of the masses, primarily the poor peasants. Young people struck blows against feudal traditions, and enthusiasm for the construction of schools, dams and clinics swept the country. For many peasants who had been illiterate, Sankara meant opening their eyes to freedom and dignity. The forbidden words ‘revolution’ and ‘anti-imperialist struggle’ spread throughout the villages and took on a sense of hope for the future. The agrarian reform implemented by the ordinance of 4 August 1984 established a national land fund, owned by the state, which gave peasants access to land. Feudal and colonial land ownership was abolished. Through the rational management of village land, Burkina Faso was one of the first countries in the world to consider environmental protection a priority in a poor country. Cereal production, on which the survival of the peasant masses depends, increased steadily between 1983 and 1987. The ‘consume Burkinabe’ policy means not being a slave to what others produce. For this principle to succeed, it is necessary to create independent national industries and thus be able to influence prices and quality. All of these transformations were established as principles but could not be implemented in the short time frame of the 1983-1987 revolution. This is a task that must be resumed and continued. We would like to highlight another contribution of the Burkinabe revolution that has become very popular. This is the People's Revolutionary Tribunals. This is something that has always horrified the bourgeois liberal conception, because the bourgeoisie knows that its law is a protective wall for its interests. The argument of force and non-compliance with the formal rules of law is trotted out whenever the interests of the minority of capital owners find themselves in a position of having to answer for their actions without being protected by all the mechanisms that allow them to live with impunity. The judges of the TPRs are chosen exclusively from among the masses of workers, members of the CDRs and professional magistrates. It is the instrument of revolutionary law against the inherited neocolonial law. The TPRs take on the task of conducting political trials, that is, of holding all supporters of the neocolonial order to account, particularly corrupt officials. The trial of former President Lamizana will be broadcast, providing a great opportunity for popular political education. The question then raised was that of the voracity of previous regimes in terms of corruption and the new possibility of eliminating it. Destroying the economic

and political base of the bureaucratic and comprador bourgeoisie necessarily requires a different kind of justice that makes it possible, in one form or another, for the masses to participate. In our review of the Burkinabe experience, we must remember two crucial aspects: 1) any project of economic independence must confront existing capitalist relations and must therefore change the balance of power between social classes, and 2) This necessity means that the political organisation of the proletariat and the peasantry is the only possible guarantee of progress in a revolutionary process.

Militant Marxism in Africa

Even if we live in this 'bizarre' period in which postmodern currents can claim to follow Gramsci and Fanon and be against Marxism, it is impossible to talk about the revolutionary path to the liberation of Africa and ignore militant Marxism, whether in past struggles or in those to come. There are many examples of struggles in Africa that have been carried out in the light of militant Marxism and which can now serve to inform current struggles and give them the most consistent direction possible. Like the Chinese, Vietnamese and Cuban experiences, the socialist experiences in Africa have destroyed the idea of a Europeanism inherent in Marxism. Cheikh Anta Diop, in his preface to his book Nations Nègres et Culture (Negro Nations and Culture), calls on African intellectuals to cultivate their Marxist education and study it carefully in order to consider its application to the specific case of their country's social reality.

In the context of this article, we can only mention certain principles that have emerged from militant African Marxism. We must recognise the richness of the experiences of liberation struggles and socialist experiments in that they challenged formidable enemies and stumbled upon questions that are being asked again in new circumstances.

Imperialism is not a structure that intervenes solely from outside in the affairs of African countries: a thousand financial, economic, bureaucratic and cultural ties link the imperialist bourgeoisie with the local ruling classes (the comprador and bureaucratic big bourgeoisie) who serve as its relays in the dominated countries. The first of these questions is therefore to know for the benefit of which classes and class alliances political change and the desire for economic independence should be pursued. The question of strengthening the power of the exploited and oppressed classes is the cornerstone of any possible liberation programme.

In the historic struggle against colonialism and neo-colonialism from the 1950s to the 1970s, new African bourgeois classes emerged under the banner of independence. The emerging and then developing contradiction between these elites of the new 'national' bourgeoisie and the popular masses led

Nkrumah, the great pan-African leader who was removed from power in Ghana by a counter-revolutionary coup in 1966, to say: "I was not tough enough, I did not move fast enough towards socialism " (The Conakry Years, p. 45). The conscious and determined struggle against the exploiting classes of one's own country is the key to determining whether a political movement is truly anti-imperialist, that is, whether it attacks the material and social roots that maintain dependence. It is true that it took a long struggle to develop a coherent conception that opposed the old ideas of a so-called 'African socialism' devoid of class struggle, as advocated by the moderate Senghor or the radical Sékou Touré.

The second major lesson from militant Marxist ideas in Africa concerns the nature of imperialist "democracy". The question of parliamentary democracy and elections must not be detached from its class content. The opposition between the armed forces and civil society is an abstract, formal and sterile opposition. Freedom has a class character and can only be imposed at gunpoint. The Vietnamese did not liberate themselves with pens and large electoral rallies. It is not the presence of the military in power that is a sign of the exploitation of the masses; "civilians" are also perfectly capable of this task. The question is one of political programme and the link with the working and peasant masses. It was this task that led Cabral to say: 'We are armed militants, not soldiers.' An oppressed country cannot liberate itself by following the criteria of Western NGOs that promote 'democracy'. But conversely, the destruction of revolutionary, popular or socialist nationalist regimes around the world has been and will continue to be carried out in the name of 'restoring democracy'.

The specific conditions of the neocolonial situation clearly require the development of a specific ideology, adapted to the precise social formation. No one can deny this, and it does not contradict any of the fundamentals of militant Marxism. Senegal, Kenya, Algeria and South Africa share a common situation of domination by Euro-American imperialism (of which Zionism is a part), but these countries are also social formations of a different nature. Every political movement that aspires to organise the masses must carefully study the social role, life and mentalities of each class in society in order to assess internal antagonisms and divisions. The study of the concrete situation is a well-known Leninist principle. As a result, the paths to liberation from global capitalism can only be diverse. But in all these specific situations, universal questions are inevitable. These include the strategy and tactics of a socialist revolution in countries dominated by imperialism; the analysis of the current development of imperialism and financial capitalism on a global scale; and the foundation of a proletarian party, a united front and the organisation of armed struggle. The specificity of each national revolutionary path does not prevent, but on the contrary requires, drawing on the achievements and lessons of the revolutionary movements of the 20th century, in particular on what enabled

them to achieve victories and bring about profound social changes. First and foremost, the political organisation of the most exploited masses, and their organisation into mass structures, is the key. Today, inter-classist revolutionary nationalist conceptions (as expressed in the AES, for example) are once again creating a positive dynamic, but it is the perspective of a revolutionary movement for socialism that can and must enable them to overcome their own limitations.

Bringing a scientific conception of the African revolution will be the work of current and future generations. It is not the revolutionary conception that guarantees victory, but the absence of a revolutionary theory that guarantees defeat. The new anti-imperialist generations have a wealth of concrete experiences and theories that must be assimilated, synthesised and raised to a higher level so that they can become weapons of liberation for the popular masses.

The AES: A Step Forward

The struggles of the last decade in many African countries, particularly in the Sahel, have reopened a historical cycle. These struggles have led to two achievements whose power is greatly underestimated: 1) the departure of French troops from the Sahel, the main symbol of a profound weakening of French imperialism; and 2) the new expression of a Pan-Africanism inherited from Sankara and the great figures of the former national liberation movements. The importance of these experiences makes them a ‘qualitative leap’; a cycle of large-scale struggles has begun. The days of the comprador bourgeoisie are numbered. The absence of a programme and a perspective for socialism in no way diminishes the significance of what is currently at stake. We are convinced of the need to go beyond challenging the stranglehold of Françafrique and to fight to eliminate the comprador classes and imperialism itself. But the way in which the revolutionary path is forged is not traced by a ‘pure’ plan.

There are at least as many formulations of Pan-Africanism as there are social classes in Africa. There is therefore a reactionary, liberal, petty-bourgeois or revolutionary Pan-Africanism. One can be a Pan-Africanist without being a revolutionary (in the name of better integration of Africa into existing imperialist relations), but one cannot be an African revolutionary without being a Pan-Africanist.

Today, African populations often feel compelled to accept the consequences of foreign powers' race for their continent's resources and suffer population displacement, violence and the effects of climate change. But the African desire to control its resources, to regain control over the destiny of countries experiencing the repercussions of the destruction of Gaddafi's Libya, and to assert themselves as truly independent countries is driving the breakaway

project that is the AES (Alliance of Sahel States). On 16 September 2023, Mali, Burkina Faso and Niger signed the Liptako-Gourma Charter, giving birth to the Alliance of Sahel States (AES). This organisation, which aims to be an alternative to the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), seeks to redraw the political and security balance in the region.

Initially a common defence pact against the threat of external military intervention, the three countries finalised the creation of the confederation in July 2024 and broadened its scope of integration.

The three military regimes wanted to go beyond the simple security front to build a common political and economic space. This situation has a thousand limitations and drains political illusions, but it has the merit of existing and persevering against all odds. Anything that goes against the spirit of submission and resignation in the face of the Euro-American bourgeoisie must be welcomed and supported as such. And for those who live in the imperialist centres and aspire to change the social relations of exploitation and capital accumulation, it is imperative to reject what 'our' own imperialism does to other peoples.

What led to the creation of the AES is well known. Firstly, there was the rejection of the 'Françafrique' system and, secondly, the struggle against the destabilisation of the Sahel. The irony of the situation before 2023 was that the Serval and Barkhane interventions were led by France and the European Union, the powers that created chaos in Libya and then in the Sahel. Historically, France established defence pacts that ensured it had a strong influence, and its involvement in Africa was motivated by access to resources, political stability and the protection of investments. As the continent was crucial to French interests, France provided military and financial support to corrupt puppet leaders in exchange for services rendered to France at the expense of their countries. Between 1960 and 1994, France updated its defence treaties with 27 African states in order to lay the legal foundations for a lasting military presence. In the 1970s and 1980s, French forces remained in more than 20 African states covering 40% of African territory, making France the most influential country in its former colonies. But in recent years, France has been unable to decide who will remain in power by choosing one or another representative of the comprador bourgeoisie. The peoples of Mali, Niger and Burkina Faso have enthusiastically supported the military groups that have pursued a policy of independence since 2020. Over the past three years, seven military coups have taken place in former French colonies, all in West or Central Africa. Two coups in Mali, in 2020 and 2021, saw a president and then an interim president removed from office. Assimi Goïta, a colonel in his forties, now rules the country. In Guinea, Alpha Condé, an octogenarian president, was removed from office by the army in September 2021 after attempting to run for a third term. The president of Burkina Faso was ousted

by the army in 2022. Eight months later, the military leader of an interim regime was overthrown by Ibrahim Traoré, a junior officer in his thirties. In July 2023, the president of Niger was removed from office and replaced by General Abdourahamane Tchiani. In Gabon, in August, Ali Bongo Ondimba, heir to his father's presidency, was replaced by General Brice Oligui Nguema: Omar and Ali Bongo had ruled the country for more than half a century. The rejection of elites who were deemed corrupt, partisans of nepotism serving France's post-colonial influence was decisive. Other factors explain why the AES experiment is taking place, starting with developments in global capitalism, in particular the rise of the BRICS countries, which make Euro-American sanctions less powerful simply because there is an alternative in terms of market access. Rebellious and patriotic factions of the African bourgeoisie want to participate in the paradigm shift in international relations. They reject as an outrage the quasi-exclusive monopoly and unequal agreements that tied their hands to the former coloniser.

Ibrahim Traoré of Burkina Faso is another recent coup leader driven by anti-imperialist political convictions. A geology student at the University of Ouagadougou, he was a member of the National Association of Students of Burkina Faso (ANEB), an organisation with marked Marxist, anti-imperialist and pan-Africanist leanings. His career path has been that of a soldier who has observed the difficulties of the neocolonial civilian government in decisively leading the fight against the waves of Sahelian ‘jihad’. At the head of the Patriotic Movement for Safeguarding and Restoration, Ibrahim Traoré expresses the aspirations of Pan-African youth and is taking measures to ensure that minerals and strategic industrial sectors can be controlled by the Burkinabe state itself. On the economic front, the AES is calling for projects to promote economic sovereignty, national control of resources and a break with the extractive model inherited from colonisation. The nationalisation of strategic mining sites and the gold, lithium and uranium sectors has already been achieved in all three countries. The AES also has another goal: breaking away from the CFA franc and thus achieving monetary independence, a long-standing project throughout the region. These sovereignty projects, aimed at developing capitalism on a national scale, are of course still in their infancy.

One point concerning a misconception deserves our attention. The profile and political line followed by the leaders of the AES show that the fundamental question that arises when assessing political power is not whether a regime is civilian or military, contrary to what the liberal culture, adored by the left-wing bourgeoisie, tries to drum into our heads. Pinochet's Chile was ruled by the military, as was Castro's Cuba. The two are polar opposites. ‘Democratic’ France adulates and mourns its military founder (De Gaulle). It does not condemn the military regimes of Mahamat Déby in Chad, Abdel Fattah Al-Sissi in Egypt or Gabon. What is condemned is not the coup d'état as such, but its political orientation. If it takes up the aspirations of the people and breaks

with the Master, it will be booed and described in the darkest terms. If we consider that African countries must aim for independence from the global imperialist system, which necessarily means nationalising foreign trade, planning economic activity, collectivising the main productive forces, and fighting without hesitation or reservation the internal forces allied with imperialism (the old ruling classes and the comprador and bureaucratic bourgeoisie), then we can consider what is happening in the Sahel to be the beginning of a long process. A beginning and therefore a step forward.

Hunger strikes as an act of resistance: The experience of the Anatolian revolutionary left

The practice of hunger strikes, mainly linked to prison struggles, is almost unknown in France, but in different parts of the world it represents an extreme but tangible form of resistance. It demonstrates that even one's own body can become a weapon of resistance in contexts such as prisons, where control and repression are total.

In Turkey, there is a long tradition of using hunger strikes as a form of resistance. This article was taken from a long interview with a comrade, from the *Anti-Imperialist Front* and of the Anatolian revolutionary left tradition; who explains the political use of this form of struggle.

After the coup d'état of 12 September 1980 (in Turkey), severe repression was unleashed and all activists, revolutionaries and left-wing movements, but also right-wing movements such as the 'Grey Wolves', were arrested. In prisons, they tried to repress political activists by all means possible and to break their will and dignity. Forty years ago, the policy was to force them to wear prison uniforms, today, the policy is to put them in solitary confinement, the mechanism changes but the idea is still the same. The idea is to destroy their political identity, to destroy their revolutionary spirit, their revolutionary struggle, their militant spirit. If you don't accept these measures (and revolutionaries obviously didn't and still don't), then you have to find a way to resist. For a revolutionary, prison is not considered a place where you stop fighting. It's just another battleground. For a revolutionary, it doesn't matter whether you are: in prison or outside, whether you are a student, a worker, whether you are active in a neighbourhood committee, a grassroots cultural association, a trade union, it doesn't matter. It is about the struggle for revolution, and that doesn't stop in prison. On the contrary, in prison it's much more important, even more important than outside, because in prison you're in the hands of your enemy. You're locked up. There are walls all around you, and in that context it's very important to be a 'free prisoner'. Your body is locked up inside, but your mind is free outside. And your mind can only be outside if you resist. You cannot remain a revolutionary in prison if you do not resist. This is one of the most important points. Prisons are institutions, regardless of the country, whether in Europe, Latin America or Turkey, and activists and revolutionary organisations are necessarily called upon to confront these repressive institutions directly. So you have a choice: either you resist, or you don't resist. But if you don't resist, you don't retain your political identity. Hunger strikes as a form of resistance are not unique to Turkish revolutionary prisoners; there were hunger strikes even 40 years ago, for example in Ireland, and there too there have been martyrs. One of the best known is Bobby Sands (1954-1981)16. He is a symbol of resistance. His martyrdom inspired political prisoners in Turkey. Thus, the hunger strike

struggle, the resistance of prisoners in Ireland, was a source of inspiration for prisoners in Turkey. It was taken as an example to follow. And I sincerely hope that the prisoners in Turkey today, as they resist, will become a source of inspiration for struggles around the world. This should be a sign of hope.

Hope means showing the path of resistance, it is a calling to all left-wing activists and their organisations. In countries like Turkey, the left is really very weak, but ideologically it is very strong, which allows the revolutionary movement to exist. When revolutionaries and their organisations were active and strong in Europe, as for example the RAF (Rote Armee Fraktion) in Germany who carried out hunger strikes and achieved great success. The Western left considers hunger strikes to be 'political suicide', but in reality it is about using one's own life for resistance... for revolution. The duty of a revolutionary is to make revolution, to resist by any means necessary. It is possible to die, but one dies physically, not ideologically. It is for this reason that the meaning and importance of the RAF disappeared when it ceased to resist both within the prisons and externally and, ultimately, this ended with the its own dissolution.

In ancient times, even in Europe, this was the struggle of revolutionary movements when they were imprisoned17. But of course, this method was also used in India. Mahatma Gandhi's resistance, for example, is very famous and also forced British imperialism and it's colonial government, to react. To these forms of resistance imperialism and fascist governments react; just this alone shows that our resistance is not useless. It may seem as if they are completely ignoring it, however this is only a tactic. It is a tactic to attempt to break the resistance. But they always react, we should never convince ourselves that fascism and imperialism do not care about our resistance. They care about it a great deal and are terrified by it.

And this also applies to resistance of hunger strikes until death in prisons. Currently, 16 revolutionary political prisoners in Turkey are on hunger strike. Two of them are on hunger strike until death and 14 are on an indefinite hunger strike. In reality, there is no great difference between an indefinite hunger strike and a hunger strike to the death, because prisoners on indefinite hunger strike will only stop if they achieve victory. It is therefore a form of resistance where one is not afraid of losing one's life. Why are they resisting? In 2021, the Turkish government built these so-called 'S-R-Y type' prisons. Prisoners call them 'well' type prisons because one can see it is similar to throwing someone into a pit in the ground. It's as if you were put somewhere and no one could hear your voice: you are forgotten forever. If you end up there and you are lost forever. The prisoners did not accept these alienating conditions and resisted. These prisons are not just a special policy of Turkish fascism they are a common model for imperialism, especially American imperialism, but also European imperialism and Zionism. Germany, France, and especially the United Kingdom, are all collaborating with fascism in

Turkey. Why? Why is imperialism interested in destroying the revolutionary movement and revolutionary struggles in Turkey? Clearly it's because it wants to exploit Turkey without any problems. The revolutionary movement will always a problem because it shows the people the path of resistance and it does not accept being a neo-colonized country, as revolutionaries demand the independence of Turkey. Independence qmeans independence from imperialism: closing all military bases, breaking all ties with imperialism, such as leaving the IMF, etc. For these reasons, these demands and ideas of the revolutionaries are dangerous for imperialism. And it is precisely for this reason that they want to destroy them.

We can therefore easily understand that it is not only in the interest of Turkish fascism, but also those of imperialism, to destroy the revolutionary movement. We, as Anatolian revolutionaries, have always said this, but it has now become clear to everyone that Turkey plays a very important role in the 'Greater Middle East' project. And we now see very clearly the role it is playing in Syria (in the destruction of the anti-Zionist government), the role they play in Lebanon (in the disarming of Hezbollah), the role they are playing in Gaza (by posing as intermediaries for American imperialism), or with all the countries with which the Turks have relations, such as Azerbaijan, for example, Turkmenistan, etc. Turkey therefore has real influence in these countries. These are traditional, cultural, historical influences and the United States is taking advantage of this. Turkey is a pawn, a puppet in the hands of imperialism. That is why we must understand Turkey's importance to imperialism and understand the importance of why imperialism does not want any real opposition in Turkey.And here for sure I am not talking about the 'NATO left' (the left wing of imperialism, strongly influenced by 'new left' postmodern and liberal thought). All these supporters of Rojava serve the interests of imperialism[18]. I am talking about the real revolutionaries who are genuinely interested in an independent Turkey. Fighting against these types of prison (S-R-Y) means not only fighting against fascism, but also against imperialism.

If we take a closer look at these 'well-type' prisons, we see that similar high-security prisons also exist in Europe and the United States: 41 bis in Italy, the famous Stammheim in Stuttgart, Germany, and Supermax in the United States. But the big difference is that in Europe and the United States, there is no resistance. In Turkey, on the other hand, there is resistance, and that is the big difference. These prisons based on the torture of isolation exist everywhere, because it is a specific policy of imperialism. But the prisoners do not understand the importance of resistance. That is a big difference. Revolutionaries in Turkey know that if they do not resist these prisons, the revolutionary struggle in Turkey cannot survive. They must do it, we must do it, we must resist. After five years, ten years, I don't know, maybe fifteen years in such a prison, you are dead. It is a slow death. I mean, the idea behind

these high-security prisons was to replace the death penalty. So, in reality, these prisons should house those sentenced to death, but that is not the case at present. Today, they also hold prisoners and even people who have not yet been convicted by the courts, as is the case with the revolutionary Fikret Akar (one of the prisoners who went on hunger strike for more than 200 days) . This comrade's trial is still ongoing, but he has been in prison since 1 February 2025. According to Turkish law, no one can be held in solitary confinement for more than 20 days without a medical certificate. They are therefore breaking their own laws.

The conditions of the 'well' type prison is as follows: it is a very small cell, measuring 4 metres by 3 metres. One of the biggest problems and differences compared to F-type prisons is that the courtyard is not adjacent to the cell. For example, in the case of Fikret Akar, he is on the third floor and the courtyard is on the second floor. And they have to stay completely alone, isolated in their cells for 23 hours. For one hour, Fikret Akar can go to the courtyard with two other people. And the big problem with the courtyard is that if you have to go back inside, for example because you need to use the toilet, you can't go back out again and so you lose that "collective" hour. Fikret Akar has been on an indefinite hunger strike for 231 days, and when you are on hunger strike, you drink continuously. So your right to an hour in the yard (which breaks your isolation) is violated. Another problem is that you have no protection from the elements. It may be sunny, it may be raining, it may be snowing, but there is no shelter from the weather. You cannot protect yourself. Another aspect of these 'well' prisons is total dehumanisation. You don't even have human interaction with the guards, because you communicate with them via the intercom. So you don't see them, you only hear a mechanical voice. Even the Chamber of Architects protests against these prisons. Everything is electric; the doors don't open with keys, but there is a central command station that opens them. So in the event of a fire or an earthquake, you are trapped, no one can save you.

Visits are limited : only your first-degree relatives can visit you not second-degree relatives. Even your brother or sister's children cannot visit. The same applies to phone calls. Once a week, you can call your first-degree relatives for 10 minutes. This means that aside from your mother, father, sister, son, wife, husband, you are completely alone. Alone with yourself, constantly on you own.

The sun does not shine through the windows, which are covered with dense bars with holes smaller than the diameter of a cigarette. In this type of cell, there is no air circulation and you cannot look out of the window. This particular condition means that you will very quickly develop serious health problems. For example, because you cannot look out of the window and the cell is very small, so you will quickly develop eye problems because the television is very close, as is everything else. You will suffer from intestinal

problems. You will have cardiovascular problems, diabetes, obesity, you will reduced to imobility, etc. But when you are in a constant state of isolation, you are obviously going to have very serious psychological problems, such as schizophrenia, panic attacks, etc.

So the question is: what should prisoners do? I mean, if they accept these conditions they accept the destruction of their political identity and their physical health. It is the reality of accepting a slow death by isolation and dehumanising conditions. You cannot live in a cell like this for years and years. It is not possible. A human being cannot live like this.

Why are prisoners fighting against this type of cell, why do they want to be transferred? They want to be transferred to F-type prisons. F-type prisons are, of course, high-security prisons and, of course, solitary confinement also exists there in some cases. The F-type prisons were introduced very violently, with the death of 20 prisoners and the subsequent massacre of another 28 prisoners on 19 December 2000. The prisoners were forcibly taken to these F-type prisons. Previously, they were in a cell where 20 or 30 people lived together. But there was resistance for seven years, from 2000 to 2007, with the martyrdom of 122 people. 122 prisoners, but also people who were not detained, lost their lives in solidarity with the political prisoners. F-cells still exist, but total isolation has been abolished. This struggle, with enormous sacrifices and martyrdom, led to victory. From an ideological point of view, too, it was a victory, showing that the revolutionary left did not capitulate and was capable of resisting and creating a new social and political consensus. In F-type prisons, three prisoners are usually held together. Another result of the resistance through hunger strikes to the death is that, in F-type prisons, the courtyard is adjacent to the cell. Only a door separates them. And thanks to the resistance through hunger strikes to the death, the door remains open all day until sunset. So, as long as there is daylight, the door remains open, more so in summer than in winter. This makes a big difference to a prisoner, obviously, a very big difference. In addition, they can talk and communicate with the cells on the right and left this therefore broadens the scope of communication among prisonners. Another consequence of the hunger strike to the death is that nine prisoners are allowed to meet once a week to talk for 10 hours. Visiting restrictions are also different. In addition to first-degree relatives, you can also receive visits from people who are not members of your family. This is why prisoners locked up in 'well' cells want to be transferred to F-type cells. In F cells, they can have books, newspapers, letters, etc. That is why they are demanding the closure of the 'well' cells and their transfer to F-type cells. As I mentioned earlier, these have been 'modified' thanks to the heroism and martyrdom of revolutionary prisoners. There are comrades such as Serkan Yilmaz and Aybek Demirdöğen who, despite being in F-type cells, have been on hunger strike for 370 days to demand the closure of the 'well' cells and the transfer of other comrades to F-

type cells. Through their resistance, these comrades are shouting to the whole world that no human being can live in these conditions of detention. Aybek Demirdöğen is also on hunger strike to the death. He is in an F-type prison. He is not in a 'well' prison. He is on hunger strike to the death for Serkan. He says that as long as Serkan's demands are not met, he will continue his hunger strike to the death. He has therefore been on hunger strike to the death for more than 250 days. The health of the three men and all their comrades on hunger strike is very critical, but they continue to resist! 'Well' prisons have existed since 2021. But there were no revolutionary political prisoners. There were prisoners from all sectors, from across the political spectrum, from the right, and from the left. Then in 2023, two years ago, revolutionary political prisoners were brought there. And they immediately went on hunger strike. Before that, no one, not even us, knew of the existence of these prisons. We learned of their existence as soon as our prisoners, our comrades, were transferred there. The right and the left (even when it had activists in prison, it did not talk about these isolation cells). For two years, there has been ongoing resistance against this type of prison, thanks to the hunger strike, and this has broken the wall of silence surrounding this torture in Turkey. And the simple fact of having broken this wall of silence is already a victory.

These 'well' prisons were not created solely for revolutionaries or political movements, but are a signal to the Turkish people. Turkish fascism wants to say to the people: " If you dare to oppose me, if you don't obey, you could end up here, so be careful'. They want to scare the population. And in this sense too, revolutionaries represent hope and and become a living example: you are not powerless in the face of this great, great, great instrument that is this institution called the state. The state may have everything. The state has the police, the army, the weapons And you the ordinary citizens, you are very weak and alone, you are nobody, you are nothing. But the revolutionaries show you the way, they show you the path of resistance, and they are an example in themselves which manifest the hopes of the people. So the people say: there are still people who resist, so it is possible, so we can resist! We must not obey fascism, we must not obey imperialism. We are not at all convinced by this fascist government. And for this reason, because popular discontent is widespread, there is a great crisis, an economic crisis, a political crisis, as the great mistrust between the people and the government widens. This contradiction therefore runs very deep. And it is for this reason that fascism is in reality very weak and uses all the means at its disposal to control and repress all forms of dissent and to intimidate the resistance.

Of course, in the current situation, they have the full support of imperialism, because of the whole policy in the Middle East, relations with Israel, etc. …as I explained previously, but that can change at any moment. Turkish fascism knows it is weak. It is not powerful. That is why the repression is very strong.

We show people that it is possible to resist. Don't worry, just resist. Don't

obey. Don't give in. Unfortunately, some political movements have completely capitulated (such as the PKK), which is obviously not positive for the forces of resistance. Some political movements capitulate, collaborate with fascism and imperialism. This is a great loss for the revolutionary left and the people.

What is the current situation in Turkey? The situation is as follows: there is very strong repression, very strong censorship, very strong disinformation. The regime's media are really trying to brainwash the population and, of course, they are succeeding with many people. Most of the population may know nothing about the revolutionary struggle, etc., but with the resistance, everyone is now talking about the 'well-type' prisons. We see it on television, even though there is heavy censorship, but they can no longer ignore it.

And all the NGOs, human rights organisations, MPs, the Medical Chamber, can make statements calling for the closure of the "well-type" prisons. Even the CHP, a bourgeois party, which is currently under heavy pressure from the government, has published a report stating that the "pit" prisons must be closed. Everyone is now talking about this type of prison and the need to close them. Before, nothing happened. But in this climate of repression, people are very afraid. People are afraid, the left is weak, and the parties are capitulating to Turkish fascism and imperialism, like the PKK. This strengthens the government. One of the reasons why Fikret Akar, Aybek Demirdöğen and Serkan Onur Yilmaz are forced to continue their struggle and their demands are not taken into consideration is as a consequence of the stance of the PKK, because the Turkish government, draws its strength from their capitulation and collaboration (Editors note: the three have all since won their struggles and their demands to be transferred to F-type prisons have been met). In these circumstances, international solidarity outside Turkey, is very important. In Turkey, as soon as you do something, you are immediately arrested or risk being arrested, but despite this, lawyers in particular are doing everything they can and taking the risk of being repressed. In Turkey, even the parents of prisoners can be arrested for sending money and clothes etc. to their children, brothers, sisters, etc. And people are really afraid. It is really the revolutionaries, both inside and outside, who can resist and who are resisting.

And now I would like to return to the question of why this hunger strike is taking place.

In these circumstances, in this reality that I have described, what other choice do revolutionary political prisoners have but to go on hunger strike, if they do not want to surrender and if they want to preserve their revolutionary identity. What other choice do they have? In Turkey and abroad, there is not only a great debate, but also an attack on the practice of hunger strike. "Why, why are you on hunger strike? Are you crazy? You are hurting yourselves! Do you think the fascist government cares about you? Do you think they will show

you mercy?" Of course not! We know fascism very well. No one knows fascism better than we do. Of course they don't care. If they could, they would kill all the prisoners, as they did on 19 December19.

Here, we have things the wrong way round: in actual fact the prisoners are not on hunger strike for the enemy, but rather for the revolutionary and solidarity forces outside the prisons. For their comrades, for people who stand in solidarity with them, and this act of resistance is in order to mobilise them. To mobilise solidarity outside and also to break the isolation and censorship. Isolation is not only inside prisons, but also outside. Because what the government wants to do is isolate solidarity movements and the very idea of revolutionary politics.

So everyone avoids having contact with you. No one wants to have anything to do with you, because as soon as you start showing your solidarity, you risk being attacked and accused of terrorism... Many people are afraid, and the hunger strike also breaks this vicious circle. The hunger strike therefore serves to mobilise solidarity, to break the isolation on the outside prison and break the censorship. Because if the prisoners weren't on hunger strike, do you think the media would talk about the problem of prisons and therefore about revolutionaries? No. You can be sure of that. Right now I am here with you doing this interview thanks to them. The political work of fighting isolation and fighting ' well type' prisons would not be at this level if they were not on hunger strike.

No one, not even political prisoners, wants to go hungry for hundreds of days. Who would want that? I mean, you can try to go hungry for a day, it's not a pleasant. Okay, there may be health practices such as fasting with water for two weeks, three weeks, where you only drink water to detoxify the body etc. Okay, this might be something different. But we're talking about a hunger strike that doesn't last three weeks or even three months Serkan Yilmaz has been on hunger strike for over a year now, Fikret and Serkan for over 250 days. It is damaging their bodies, their health. I causes them very serious irreversible damage. You will have to live with that. And if you don't die; if you survive this resistance, you will have to live with these consequences for the rest of your life. And who wants that? All prisoners who have been on hunger strike for more than 100 days suffer enormously every day. It is very painful. It is painful when you go on hunger strike, when you do not eat. You have muscle pain, your nerves die, you lose the ability to touch things and your feet burn and get cold. So they suffer every day, from very intense pain. After a while, even your body becomes its own enemy. You have to fight against your own body. Believe me, no one wants to live with this pain. It is no stroll in the park to go on hunger strike. But you should not think that these people are crazy. Do they want to die and suffer enormously? No. They do not want that. If they are forced to sacrifice their health and their lives, it is because the left is weak. The stronger the solidarity, the more we do for them,

the less they have to sacrifice themselves. So we must not get the wrong idea about these hunger strikes. It is not romantic and it is not beautiful, it is painful. But it is heroic. It is heroic! And we can be proud of them because they live every day with this pain, because they fight against their own bodies, because they face the consequences on their health for the rest of their lives. We can be proud, we should take their determination and militant spirit as an example for ourselves. And we should support them. We should support them, we should do everything we can. They are not only doing it for themselves, they are not only doing it for Anatolia, but they are really doing it for the whole world, because it is, I mean, it is a last resort. If we look at it from the point of view of resistance against imperialism, we could say that there are presently two places where resistance is truely historical in the sense that the resistance will continue on for future generations. Those currently resisting may die, but the struggle will continue with a new generation who is inspired by this resistance of the past. These are two places are Gaza, and those resisting the well-type prisons. We too are inspired by Gaza. In Gaza, officially, 70,000 people have been massacred by Israel, but the fact that they do not surrender and do not abandon their lands is really a big problem for imperialism which has understood that their resolute defiance is because the people have gained class consciousness.

The left has lost its class consciousness, but even that is not enough for imperialism, it must destroy all those who resist. And they do not want there to be anyone who resists and becomes the light; the torch for the future, who shows the path of resistance. Imperialism wants to exist forever, and to do so, it must destroy all forms of resistance. Moreover, what the prisoners are doing now is for Turkey, for Europe, for the whole world, and for the future of mankind. Imperialism knows this, fascism knows this, which is why they want to destroy them. And we must support them for this reason; it is our duty to support them. These are not crazy prisoners on hunger strike, they are the resistance. They are the last bastion of existing resistance and revolutionary struggle against imperialism.

In the Western left, the idea of resistance has long been lost. The sincere solidarity of large sections of the left towards Georges Ibrahim Abdallah; unfortunately was far from supporting the *political identity* of the revolutionary Abdallah...20 Today, this revolutionary, finally back in his country, Lebanon, still offers us bursts of passion and insight shaped by a lifetime of struggle.

Grup Yorum: 40 years of resistance to fascism
interview with a member of the Anatolian music group

The legendary Marxist-Leninist musical group Grup Yorum celebrates its 40th anniversary in 2025. It does so while its concerts are completely banned in Turkey, more than 20 members of Grup Yorum are in prison; they are persecuted for the simple fact of belonging to Grup Yorum. But the attacks by Turkish fascism do not stop there.

Recently, YouTube and Spotify blocked access to Grup Yorum's songs from Turkey, without any legal basis. The Turkish regime is trying to destroy Grup Yorum because it brings together millions of people in the struggle against fascism and imperialism.

How is Grup Yorum conducting its struggle under the current conditions of unprecedented pressure and persecution, and what is the outcome of 40 years of work and resistance by the musicians? Bahar Kyzalaltun, a member of Grup Yorum, recounted this in an interview with the Anti-Imperialist Front. The interview was recorded in June of this year, and in July, Bahar was abducted on the street and arrested. Grup Yorum is being erased from history and from the memory of the people. The repression is intensifying and it is clear why; because repression is met with resistance. There is a cultural and artistic tradition that cannot be destroyed by oppression. There is a revolutionary culture and an artistic tradition. That is why the measures taken so far are no longer enough for them and they are forced to intensify the pressure.

What we are faced with now is completely different from what we remember experiencing a few years ago.In the history of Grup Yorum, there has always been persecution. Albums have been shot at, the production company has been threatened, concerts have been banned, and members of the band have been arrested. But such a systematic attempt to erase the band’s melodies and compositions from people’s memories, and to sever all ties with them, has never happened before. We are now living under conditions of overt fascism.

We are a Turkish, Anatolian band. We are a revolutionary band. And, of course, we will be persecuted.

UNTIL WE GET RID OF FASCISM IN OUR COUNTRY,

UNTIL WE GET RID OF IMPERIALISM,

WE MUST FACE THIS OPPRESSION.

Today, the pressure is increasing day by day. The series of concert bans that began in 2016 has spread to bans on events, online concerts, rehearsals and, ultimately, even if you do nothing, simply belonging to Grup Yorum can be enough to get you arrested. We are not saying, 'What else can we do to survive?' We are facing fascism, and of course it will attack to maintain its power.

Today, the so-called 'free' platforms – social media, YouTube, Spotify – these alternative media are also places where we are censored. Because neither arrests, nor torture, nor concert bans, nor raids on the 'İdil' cultural centre every five or six months, nor the looting of our institution – none of this has been able to stop Grup Yorum. On the contrary, it has made Grup Yorum stronger.

It has helped us become one big family. It has led to even greater support from the public. Because we have stood firm.

I would like to share this with you: recently, when we met our friend, a young film director, he said to us: 'We are standing tall because you are holding your heads high with pride'.

Of course, we were proud of these words. Of course, we will maintain our dignity. But we also realised that we were actually being watched by people we thought we could never reach or whose existence we were not even aware of. And the fact that we behaved with dignity, that we did not bow our heads and that we upheld the tradition of revolutionary art gave rise to a new generation of young artists who sided with the people.

Even though because of the attacks, we may not be able to meet these people directly, the people still follows us, artists follow us, and this influences them in one way or another – they find inspiration in it.

And to put an end to all this, they now want to erase even the name of Grup Yorum. As if this group had never existed, as if it had not written more than 500 compositions over the last 40 years, they want to erase our songs one by one from the public's memory.

In reality, this is a deeply rooted and wide-ranging attack. Perhaps we do not fully realise the gravity of the situation, because society's support is very strong, but this is a kind of attack that could be described as an attempt to erase Grup Yorum from history, as opposed to physical torture and pressure.

They are trying to behave as if this group had never existed, but that is impossible.

It really is impossible. When Pir Sultan was alive, when Karajaoglu was alive, there was no YouTube, no Google, no Spotify, but they exist today. That is why the idea that Grup Yorum can be destroyed by removing it from these

platforms is, from the point of view of those who want to destroy us, a pitiful idea. That is the only way to describe it. And we will not let this public support die out. Make them understand that.

Now, beyond us as individuals, there is the reality of Yorum. Today, the Yorum group is not limited to a certain circle of people. Even before we understood what was happening, what had been suppressed, what had happened, the public had already become aware of the situation, reacted and started playing and broadcasting the music of the Yorum group everywhere.

Thus, the truth of the Yorum group, the tradition of the Yorum group, has gone beyond the limits of our organisation – it has become a popular tradition. That is why they cannot put an end to it.

There is a famous story – I won't go into details – but the story of the priest goes like this: ‘At first, they came for the communists, and I didn't protest because I wasn't a communist. Then they came for me, and there was no one left to defend me.’ "

Since 2016, the band Grup Yorum has faced a wave of bans. And we lost Helin and Ibrahim, who became martyrs, just so that we could continue to give concerts. We defended our songs with our bodies. Two of our friends sacrificed themselves so that our songs and Grup Yorum could live on. Even when our friends went on hunger strike, we were subjected to severe censorship and isolation. It was only thanks to Helin and Ibrahim's deadly hunger strike, thanks to their sacrifice, that we were able to overcome this ordeal.

AND YORUM EXISTS.

YOU CANNOT DESTROY YORUM.

YOU CANNOT STOP YORUM.

We will start giving concerts again. You cannot weaken our influence, not only on people, but also on artists. Yorum is truly a driving force. I am not saying this just because I am part of Grup Yorum. I too have learned a lot from this group. I was its student. I am still a student and a teacher – we all are. That is why, when we speak well of Yorum, when we express our pride, it is not out of populism. On the contrary, we can talk about it with complete peace of mind, because we have paid the price for every note.

Yes, as we have already said, it all started with Yorum. Everyone thought: ‘Yorum is already a revolutionary music group. They are brave, willing to take risks, but we cannot afford to do so. Their position is clear. They are a revolutionary group. Their line is defined. It does not concern us.’ But it turned out that this was not the case.

Fascism does not recognise the right to exist of any voice or person that does not correspond to its interests. That is exactly what happened. It was the same in Nazi Germany. Only the Nazis had the right to live. Only they had the right to express themselves.

Here, too, the voices of revolutionary artists were the first to be affected. But today, anyone who does not support the government's collaboration with imperialism is silenced. Eventually, even pop musicians were affected.

Today, history is repeating itself. 454 videos by Grup Yorum, the recordings of our 'Independent Turkey' concerts " during the reign of the AKP (Justice and Development Party, led by President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan) have been deleted. The recordings of our 25th anniversary concert in İnen, which took place during the AKP era, have also been deleted. All this has been done under the pretext of national security.

And yet, we organised these concerts under their government. In fact, in order to organise our concerts in honour of our 30th anniversary, we had to apply for a gathering permit, as our concert permit applications had been rejected. And if the event is officially considered a gathering, the police must be present.

At our large-scale concerts, such as the one we gave in front of 700,000 people in Izmir and 200,000 in Ankara, the police, governors, local officials and the state itself were aware of what was happening. These concerts were organised with their consent, even with that of senior officials. But they have not succeeded in taming Yorum.

We are now facing a large-scale campaign of destruction. They are even banning concerts that we organised under their regime, in the name of 'national security'.

Turkey is ruled by fascism

I mentioned the story of the priest earlier. I would like to come back to it. There is a difference between knowing something and truly understanding it. If you understand, you act accordingly. Everyone knows this story. People think they understand its meaning. But in reality, they do not understand it, because they do not understand fascism.

They think we live in an imperfect democracy, and that what we are experiencing therefore makes no sense. Neither the soul can bear it, nor the mind can understand such injustice. We say, 'It's madness, a collective delusion, it will pass.' But no, it will not pass, because the system itself exists to preserve fascism. We live under a government that collaborates with imperialism to support fascism. That is why we must go through all this.

Today, Yorum will live. But if artists and intellectuals do not show the same

activity and sensitivity as during the hunger strike, if they do not stand shoulder to shoulder with us on the same barricade against fascism, the same thing will happen to them. And when that happens, they will be shocked and crushed, because they do not understand what fascism is. We believe that this is where the real problem lies.

One must be blind not to see what is happening and what is going to happen. To open our eyes, we must stop making excuses for ourselves. We must stop consoling ourselves by saying that we live in a democratic society, even if it is imperfect. We must recognise the reality: we are ruled by fascism. And once we have accepted this truth, we must fight it.

This is what people are actually avoiding. As the slogan says:

'Side by side against fascism' — otherwise, it will continue.

The revolutionary potential is growing

Even if we cannot be physically alongside these people, these young people, even if every attempt to organise a small concert ends in a ban or an arrest, we know that our struggle is sowing seeds in the minds of the younger generation. The potential is growing. And that is precisely what the fascist government is trying to stop.

They like to label generations — 'Generation Z,' etc. But we think that's not quite true. Young people are always the future. By calling them 'Generation Z,' they are somehow belittling them, as if they were just children of the internet, phones or computers. But we can see that this is not the case. In recent months, after what happened with the state-appointed guardians and the public reaction, the last red line has been crossed. When you arrest the mayor of Istanbul, it means that public safety is threatened. Everyone saw this clearly, young people and the general public.

And then we saw something else:

Since the Gezi protests, popular discontent has been growing in the country – it is being repressed, but it is building up. It is ready to explode. But the pressure is too strong. The main political parties, even those that claim to be left-wing, are holding back this movement.

The forces that could lead this movement – revolutionary artists, revolutionaries, mass democratic organisations – are under pressure. They are cut off from the people, their members are constantly imprisoned. That is why we could not see this growing revolutionary potential, this dissident youth.

But now we see it.

We saw it clearly after the last ban. If YouTube and Spotify hadn't blocked us, we would never have known that on the campus of Mimar Sinan University,

young people aged 20 to 30 are singing the songs of Grup Yorum. Or that at Middle East Technical University (METU), even though we haven't played there for nearly ten years, there is still a generation of students who know and listen to Yorum.

Now we know, because we receive videos from all over the world. Young people sing Yorum songs in the metro and send us their recordings. Videos filmed in homes in Didim, where people sing our songs and send them to us.

The Izmir Musicians' Association distributes videos. Videos come to us from Mimar Sinan, Istanbul University, Middle East Technical University and other universities. Young people are expressing their opinions. Of course, we already knew this. Today, we see it with our own eyes. We could see the potential we had created before, but we saw it from a different angle. To destroy it, they tried to make us completely inaccessible to the public, to make Yorum inaccessible. They tried to impose a ban in order to deprive us of the opportunity to communicate with the public, for example by removing us from social media and the internet.

But this had the opposite effect. On the contrary, our songs are now being broadcast and sung everywhere in response. And they cannot stop it. They may be able to close our official pages, they do it constantly. We open a new one. The next day, account X is closed. Access to Instagram is blocked. Our official YouTube page is closed. Videos uploaded to Kalan Music are deleted. But everyone knows Yorum's videos and songs.

We're not saying that our songs should belong exclusively to us. Of course, there's the copyright aspect, but Yorum has never thought about that. Given the conditions we live in, we can't even keep track of that kind of thing. One way or another, Yorum's songs are broadcast and sung everywhere. Perhaps someone is profiting from them, as was the case with Neshet Ertaş. Neshet Ertaş wrote hundreds of songs and never received any royalties; he never claimed them. Because he wasn't interested in that. We have experienced the same thing.

Today, we see that the public feels a tremendous sense of belonging, not for profit, but quite the opposite. People share Yorum's videos at the risk of being arrested, at the risk of having their homes searched. That's why it's impossible to stop this. Yorum's songs and videos are viewed by thousands of people. Even if they delete or block us, others will publish our work – and this is already happening. Even now, when you go on YouTube, they think they have blocked it, but Yorum's songs continue to be listened to.

The false ‘revolution’ and the struggle of Grup Yorum

First of all, we must be wary of anything that imperialism tries to pass off as a ‘revolution.’ So let's briefly explain what a revolution is. A revolution is an

upheaval that leads to the collapse of the institutions of the base and the superstructure. You destroy the system and its institutions and create something new in their place. If we examine the concept of 'digital revolution', we see that this term is used to describe platforms such as YouTube, Spotify and various social networks.

The owners of these platforms – Google, Facebook, Instagram, X (Twitter), Spotify – are the richest people in the world. They are imperialists. These platforms – YouTube, Spotify, Netflix, etc. – were created to culturally dominate people under the guise of freedom. This is the politics of imperialism. And liberals support it. These are concepts created by so-called intellectuals and writers who have no real connection to the left, socialism or the people. In reality, they admire imperialism and try to profit from it by calling themselves democrats, leftists, progressives. They want to be respectable, but they are funded by imperialists.

Who has the most interest in spreading concepts such as the digital revolution? The imperialists. Because they want to exploit us to exhaustion and then make us believe that we are free. We think we are free simply because we can think 'freely,' but we only think what they want us to think. And because we can think this way, we believe that it is our own idea and that we are free. But this is not the case.

The word 'revolution' is used indiscriminately: 'digital revolution', 'carnation revolution', 'orange revolution', etc. Whenever imperialism wants to change the world and sees an obstacle to its exploitation — a country, a government, an association, a music group, a mass organisation — it doesn't matter. To crush them, it uses two main tactics. The first is violence. The second is the idea that "if communism is to exist, we will impose it". If people want freedom, we will give them our version of freedom and make them believe that this is freedom.

We are faced with large-scale monopolies. But we have to be realistic. We must not exaggerate their power. They want us to believe that we are powerless, that we cannot compete with them, that we are nothing. That we, the people, cannot do anything on our own, that we cannot organise anything. They want us to think that way.

Grup Yorum has been around for 40 years.

When it was founded, YouTube and Spotify didn't exist yet. Our songs weren't on them, but we still brought together thousands, hundreds of thousands of people. And it's only been a few years since our songs became available on Spotify. Before that, we weren't there, it's very recent. Even without Spotify and YouTube, we found people, and people sang our songs.

Today, it may seem abstract: without CDs, without cassettes, without

concerts, how are you going to get your ideas across to the public? Everyone uses YouTube, Spotify, Apple Music. Without these platforms, some will say that you won't survive, that your name will be forgotten, erased. That's not true. If it were true, people wouldn't exist either. Only the imperialists would exist. But they too need people — to continue exploiting them, they need millions of people. That's us. We are part of the people. Maybe we're trying to dig a well with a needle, but we distribute our new songs, our singles, on paper cards with QR codes, door to door. When people scan the QR code, the song is downloaded to their phone.

It's not a sale. This is how Yorum gets to know people. Popular artists go to the people, not only to sing or sell a song, but also, perhaps, to find future members of Yorum, future employees of the Idil Cultural Centre, to get to know people and build relationships. That's how we see it. That's why Grup Yorum cannot be silenced. Not because we had big sponsors or companies funding us. No! We succeeded through 40 years of hard work and strong ties with millions of people.

In 2023, we were the most popular music group on Spotify. And that's not thanks to marketing. It's the result of 40 years of hard work. Today, if we organised a concert in Istanbul, we could bring together more people than the AKP or the RNP (the Republican People's Party, the oldest political party in the Turkish Republic, occupies centre-left and Kemalist positions – editor's note). We could bring together five million people, we are convinced of that. No government or political party can do that. But Grup Yorum can afford to do so because it creates music with the aim of building a socialist, totally independent and democratic Turkey, it tells people the truth, it never grovels, it never gives in, it never makes concessions for profit.

That is why Grup Yorum occupies such an important place in people's hearts.

That is why, when we ask ourselves how to defeat these media monopolies, the answer is: with the help of the people.

We spread our songs from door to door, addressing people one by one. Is it difficult? Yes. It's not easy. But that's our method.

It has always been this way.

Let them censor us as much as they want. We are in Okmeydan, in the ‘Idil’ cultural centre. There are hundreds of thousands of houses here. We will go and knock on their doors. They will not be able to stop us. How could they censor that? How can they block that? They can't. And it's not just us: our listeners send the songs to their neighbours, their friends, their loved ones, by any means possible. To consider Yorum as just a music group is a mistake. Yorum is a big family.

Our slogan ‘Grup Yorum is the people, and they cannot be silenced’ is not just a slogan. It is real. It is flesh and blood. It's part of life. We live among 85 million people. And we will reach those 85 million, have no doubt. No matter how many of us are imprisoned, even if there are only one or two people left free, even if there is no one left, Yorum has gone beyond the realm of individuals. It has become a tradition. It will spread independently of us.

Right now, everyone supports Yorum. Because the attack is directed against the people, and what Yorum is experiencing – all layers of oppression – may not have been entirely clear before. But today, fascism has shown it in all its glory. Perhaps we were not able to demonstrate it so clearly, either to the media or to the people. But thanks to them, everything has become extremely clear. And they are reaping what they have sown. They openly declared what they wanted to do: destroy Yorum. And the people responded: ‘You cannot destroy Yorum. Because Yorum is us.’

Resistance to ‘well’ type prisons

We have always said, ‘We create music for those who resist.’ But we are already part of those who resist.

We are on the side of those who resist. In other words, contrary to what bourgeois humanists say, we do not create art by sympathising with people or the oppressed, by understanding them, by creating art based on empathy. We are already on their side, with the oppressed, on the same front, experiencing the same things as them.

That is why it is of course important to be the voice of those who resist in ‘well’ type prisons, to write poems for them, to transform their resistance into an epic, to compose lyrics and music. But right now, our friends are already in these ‘well’ type prisons. It is not just a matter of being the voice of the revolutionaries who are resisting there, it is a matter of the fact that our own friends are there and they are resisting, they have declared an indefinite hunger strike.

This is the practice of Grup Yorum. It has been our practice for 40 years. Everything we have said on stage, everything we have defended, we have put into practice. We have not spoken on stage about things we have not done ourselves. The same applies to resistance in ‘well’type prisons.

On 6 February 2024, all members of Grup Yorum, without exception, were arrested during an operation. After this operation, I too was arrested. We were all exiled to prisons in different provinces of Turkey. Our friends were also sent to ‘well’ type prisons. Jem, Vedat and Rezzan immediately declared an indefinite hunger strike after their exile. When they arrived, they realised that it was a ‘well’ type prison.

They realised that it was one of the recently created S or Y type prisons, and declared: We will not become a stone covered with moss at the bottom of a well.

But they managed to do so with the resistance forces, the revolutionary movements in other countries. Because, unfortunately, they capitulated. They accepted extremely shameful and inhumane conditions because they capitulated under the pressure of the isolation imposed by imperialism – an isolation that destroys them in prisons, an isolation that eliminates them. But we do not accept this.

Yes, prisons are an inevitable situation for our struggle and for Yorum; we are arrested, we are imprisoned. But we do not adapt to it. By that I mean that we know this reality, a reality in which we can be arrested, but the fact that we can be sent to 'well' type prisons, F-type prisons, at any time is another matter.

The 'well' prison model — with 13-metre-high walls, where air, sun, light, even raindrops cannot penetrate, and where all contact with people is completely cut off; where we 'talk on the phone' with the guards; where we are deprived of the right to ventilation; where, in a tiny cell, you wash your damp clothes, eat your food, use the bathroom, dry your laundry in this tiny space where mould constantly grows because of the humidity and where you get sick in a very short time — it destroys you physically.

Furthermore, through their inhumanity and isolation, they try to slowly undermine your identity, that is, your political identity. Human beings are social beings, and one can only lead a healthy life and have a healthy soul by communicating with others. I mean, there are single-celled organisms that live alone, but they are still parasites. We are not parasites, we are not single-celled organisms, we are human beings. We are revolutionary artists, and we will not remain alone in these wells, like moss-covered stones.

It is very human – if we put aside the revolutionary component – it is what every person should do. These conditions are unacceptable; it is impossible to live like this. Our friends did it. And even before them, those who were arrested and sent to the "well " – Jamil, Jem, Vedat, Rezzan and Bakijian Isik – won the victory; they came out of the 'wells". Today, Ali Araj is being held in the "well" type prison No. 1 in Sinjar and is resisting, like all revolutionary prisoners.

Grup Yorum – the voice of resistance against fascism

Grup Yorum is a musical group created after 1980. Even back then, journalists used terms such as 'prison musicians' or " prison singers" in their articles. Because after 12 September, the pulse of the people beat in the prisons. All the revolutionaries had been arrested, the prisons were

overcrowded, the junta oppressed the people, trampling them like a steamroller; wherever they were, the members of the resistance found themselves in prison. In particular, in the Istanbul prisons of Metris, Sagmalcılar...

That was where the pulse of life beat, where the heart of the resistance beat, and the group Grup Yorum was naturally born in response to the actions of the junta on 12 September.

It was in the prisons that there was life, resistance, hope, which is why Yorum first turned to the prisons and began writing songs for those who resisted.

Thus, since our creation, even though we were not yet born, one of the preconditions for the existence and emergence of Yorum was the fascist prisons and the resistance of the revolutionaries in the prisons. For 40 years, we have maintained contact with these resistance fighters and revolutionary prisoners, and we have also had links through compositions and song lyrics. And today, this is neither surprising nor unusual. Whatever we say, whatever decision we propose to people, we also respond to these demands and put them into practice. I can say that this is what resistance is all about.

Grup Yorum is the people, it cannot be silenced

When we first heard about the bans on YouTube and Spotify, our initial reaction was to organise a campaign with hashtags on X for two consecutive days. In the meantime, our X account was blocked, access was restricted, and although we planned to organise a campaign with hashtags, the account continued to be blocked. We opened a new account, created a backup copy, but 24 hours later, that one was also blocked.

So, under these conditions, even though social media is banned, we are still trying to reach people through social media, as it is one of the important tools we have. Despite strict bans on social media and constant account blocks, we were trending in Turkey for two consecutive days.

On the first day, we were already at the top of the trends. Two hours after the hashtag was launched, they deleted 11,000 posts with the hashtag "#GrupYorumHalktırSusturulamaz" (Grup Yorum is the people, they cannot be silenced). This shows how intolerant they are: they cannot even tolerate a hashtag. On the second day, we launched an appeal with the hashtag '#GrupYorumBenim" (I am Grup Yorum). Once again, we were trending in Turkey.

And during this time, we of course launched various appeals to the public:

• Download all the videos and songs by Grup Yorum that you have on the internet, on all social media platforms, on all your accounts; download them as actively as possible.

• Play Grup Yorum songs in cafés.

• Play them on buses.

• Play them at weddings.

• Play them at circumcision parties.

• Play them in your communities, at events you attend.

And we received very quick responses. For example, a video came to us from a train connecting Ankara to Eskişehir: Grup Yorum was playing on the train's loudspeakers. A video came from a campus. A video arrived from a jam session. A video arrived from people's homes. We will continue this call. It was not just a short-term campaign. From that moment on, we made a simple request to our listeners: listen to Grup Yorum, broadcast Grup Yorum.

We received messages from programmers or people who, without being programmers, knew about computer programming. For example, one person opened a channel on Telegram, uploaded all the MP3 files there and sent the link. You can share this. 'Your songs are here. Telegram users can listen to them from here.' Others created different pages. So people are supporting us and making suggestions. Of course, we want more of them.

Let's call on them again: now that imperialism is attacking us with technology, using this technology not for the good of humanity but for its own profit, causing harm to humanity, the children of the people who know about technology must also use their intelligence and their work for the good of the people, for the good of the popular actors, and contact us. Let's call on them.

What can we do to overcome these bans? Surely there is a way. They are not subject to any law or order when they act in this way. There has been no court decision banning Grup Yorum's songs, but in just a few hours, they can delete 454 of our videos in a single day. If this is the case, how are we going to get around these bans? We can get together and think about it. If we have any suggestions, we will discuss them and decide together how to proceed.

As you know, we have new singles, and Spotify has also removed them. We release them from time to time. Again, anyone can print them themselves using QR codes and distribute them.

Graffiti is appearing. Despite the fact that we have not called for it, graffiti saying 'Grup Yorum Halktır Susturulamaz' is appearing on walls, in the underground, on university campuses. We are receiving photos. This can be done again. Let's stop there for now. Of course, we are thinking about what else we can do. As ideas come up, we will implement them. We will also continue to call for this. In the future, we will continue our activities within Yorum.

In addition, we are located in the ‘Idil’ cultural centre — allow me to mention that as well. As you know, this is the home of Yorum. Despite all these attacks, not only are we preserving Yorum, but we are also publishing our magazine ‘Tavyr’. We also have an alternative cultural and artistic magazine in the field of literature. And despite the fact that we have 21 prisoners and all their work and responsibilities rest on our shoulders, we continue to publish Tavyr. And we publish it again on the Internet using a QR code — let's invite people to read it, to follow it.

We will continue our efforts in all artistic fields to destroy imperialist hegemony — against the decadent and corrupt art of imperialism — and to develop popular art, the revolutionary art of the people, in order to reach people through music, literature, cinema and other fields.

No matter how they try to encircle us, our horizon is very broad. Because we love our people, we love our homeland and we will not let it be torn apart by this rotten regime. We will not let our youth be wasted or our values destroyed. We will defend revolutionary art. As Yorum, we have taken this mission to heart, let me say.

Perhaps in other fields, such as cinema, we have not yet created an organisation as important as Grup Yorum, which has been around for 40 years and has become a benchmark, but, as we have already said, we continue to work in all fields. And we will win, that is certain. We will defeat the decadent art of imperialism with popular art. Let me put it that way.

Bahar Kyzalaltun, member of Grup Yorum

interview conducted by Belarusian comrades from the Anti-Imperialist Front, summer 2025

anti-imperialism.by

Interview with rapper ERZIN

1) The lyrics of your songs are a punch in the face to the conformity of German society. Where do you get your inspiration from and what themes do you address?

It's easy to answer the question of where I get my inspiration from. I come from a politically active family; I've never known anything else. While others spent their free time at amusement parks, I went to demonstrations.

The main figures who inspired me were İbrahim Kaypakkaya, Che Guevara and Karl Marx.

The meaning of their lives was to fight against injustice and make the world a better place.

I don't focus on a single goal. It's about anti-fascism as a whole, in all its forms. We fight against injustice, racism and exploitation.

2) The imperialist culture industry dominates and shapes the behaviour of the working classes. Pop music and rap are associated with the cultural models imposed by imperialism: money, violence, sex, etc. A popular counterculture is therefore necessary. In your opinion, in what spaces and areas can it emerge?

Unfortunately, the struggle against imperialism cannot be won overnight.

It is a long-term struggle that requires perseverance.

Counterculture can take many forms, and this is essential.

It can be expressed through music, as I do, in order to reach as many people as possible.

It can also emerge through politically engaged media that do not allow themselves to be intimidated, also in the streets, through demonstrations and organisations.

3) Anti-communism, hatred and racism towards the working classes are very present in Europe today. A new generation wants to fight not only ‘against’ but also ‘for’ something: for resistance and for a new world. How can music contribute to this?

By spreading political values on the streets through music.

I often receive messages from young people who have become interested in politics thanks to my work.

It is true that political music often appeals to people who are already politicised, but we are also managing to spark the interest of young people who had never been exposed to politics before.

I hope that others will follow our example in order to encourage as many people as possible to become politically engaged.

I also hope that we will make left-wing rap accessible to a wider audience. That's why we use modern and attractive rhythms to make the message more powerful.

4) Music, like all art forms, is controlled by the market and therefore by imperialism. How do you resist these ‘sirens’?

I refuse to let myself be oppressed.

People are constantly trying to put obstacles in my way. My videos are reported thousands of times. Leading opposition politicians draw attention to my music, and the subject is even raised in the Bundestag.

This is a good sign, as it means that the music is reaching a lot of people, whether in a negative or positive way. Everyone understands the message!

Gli artisti Che non abbiamo
The artists we don't have (Italy)

We interviewed the members of the Italian group 'Gli artisti che non abbiamo' (The artists we don't have), who use AI in an intelligent and creative way, bringing to life a series of songs, music and videos thanks to AI, thus overturning the capitalist logic of artificial intelligence. The self-deprecating name highlights the absence of musicians today who serve the masses and their interests. We believe that this type of experiment should be widely supported and exported, including to France.

1) Imperialist cultural hegemony is dominant, and artistic expressions tend towards a 'self-absorbed', "hedonistic" and 'decadent' vision that reflects the crisis currently affecting the capitalist mode of production. You have chosen another path, what is the source of this perspective?

Let's start with a fact. Culture and music are never neutral. Today, the music that is most popular with the masses is objectively bad. It is a mass-produced product, created to be simplistic: omnipresent, very accessible and without any demands. Millions of people find themselves drawn into it despite themselves, even consumed by it. It's function is not to be not 'neutral'. It is an instrument of the very industry that produces, designs, constructs, distributes and promotes it. It is an instrument of the ruling class. It is propaganda for the ruling class. It is a weapon of the ruling class.

Our experience was born out of a reflection: what if we tried to give revolutionary content to this shitty music that is so popular today? We immediately claimed (we wrote the article '*Manifesto of Synthetic Music'*) to be an agitprop collective and not a group of musicians, let alone artists. We are a collective of communists, we are workers and we are activists. The combination of these elements led us to look at reality as it is, not as we would like it to be.

We said to ourselves, very humbly, that we were fed up with classist prejudices against crappy music, which is the music of the masses, and to which the masses are 'condemned'. Commercial music is devoid of content, its lyrics are often meaningless, it glorifies toxic situations and contexts, it talks endlessly about love in all its forms, it perpetuates stereotypes of all kinds.

We also told ourselves that we were fed up with militant alternative music. Militant music, even though it helped us grow up, presents two problems today: it is a niche musical genre (it is not listened to by the masses) and it is almost exclusively music that denounces the shitty world we live in, the police, racism, the thousand problems of capitalist society... So many

denunciations that, in the long run, it feels a bit like powerlessness.

But our experience was also born out of provocation. Even our name is provocative : '*The artists we don't have*'. On a superficial level, the name refers to the fact that our music is not played by musicians, and that the voices you hear do not belong to singers (but rather AI). On a deeper level it reflects the truth that in the Italian music scene, we don't have artists who go beyond denouncing the evils of capitalism; often solely with an attitude of giving out.

So, As novices in musical composition, we thought that we might very well be able to make music of the same mediocre artistic quality as commercial and mainstream music (the composition is nearly always pretty much the same), but with another characteristic of the Bolsheviks (besides humility) content that 'goes on the offensive' so to speak. Because, as we write in *L'ora è ora*: "*Look how many of us there are, let's go on the counter-attack, we have always resisted, it won't be the fire of a night of rioting, but a war on war, our war, the war of revenge*".

2) There is often, on the part of certain sectors of the 'movement', a 'neo-Luddite' critique of machines and technological developments, which reflects an inability to use Marxism: workers are not against machines, but against those who operate them... Your use of AI represents a refreshing approach to its application.

A knife can be used to cut food or to kill, depending on how the person wielding it wants to use it. The same is true of AI. The bourgeoisie uses it to divert the masses from class struggle, it uses it to fuel its system of exploitation, it turns technological progress into an instrument of stupefaction and distraction from reality, as well as a means of eliminating jobs. The fact is that, just as the ruling class can use it for its own ends, we, comrades, can also use it for ours. We do not believe that AI can replace musicians, singers, artists, nor do we believe that it should. As we have already said, our project has no artistic pretensions. It is simply a project born of this era in which we have, more or less, free access to the technologies created by the ruling class. The fact is, we have things to say. Today, we have found a way to express them—a method of turning the ruling class's own weapons of distraction and stupefaction against them.

We have already said it, and we repeat it: we are not a music group, we are not artists, we are an agitprop group experimenting with different forms of communist propaganda. We claim not to be artists, but we also claim to be the authors of the lyrics. There you have it, all of this comes from us. And we want to say it and repeat it, because it is a thorny subject for people who often approach this project with mistrust, because they see AI as an absolute evil. On the contrary, we believe that if it exists and can be useful in making communism a concrete reality for the masses, it is good to use it.

This debate on progress and technology born under the bourgeois regime and on how communists should use it is not new in the communist movement; it is a theme that has already been addressed and overcome in the Soviet Union.

As early as 1921, at the Eighth All-Russian Trade Union Conference, Stalin declared: *"At one time there were "Marxists" in our country who asserted that the railways left to us after the October Revolution were bourgeois railways, that it would be unseemly for us Marxists to use them, that they should be torn up … For this they were nicknamed "troglodytes"*" this is an example of the level of hysertia that can be reached. Stalin's position, which became the official party line, was that the Soviet state should appropriate these bourgeois legacies and put them at the service of socialist goals.

There you have it. We agree with Stalin. It is not machines or technological progress that are the problem, but those who use them, in the interests of which class and for what purpose.

3) In terms of form and content, your texts are 'direct' and break with the so-called 'left wing of NATO'. What themes do you focus on?

First of all, we are happy that our texts are perceived as direct, because that is what we want to be.

Even in our communication on social media, we do not want to give in to self-censorship for fear that the algorithm will deprive us of visibility (which is already the case, by the way).

It's also a provocation and an 'experiment'. We have no idea how it will turn out. For now, we have a channel with only modest amount of followers, so we are penalised, but only to a certain extent. Will they delete our profiles? It's possible. The bourgeoisie has the means to do so and has never hesitated to silence and censor. As we said, our project is intended to be provocative in several ways. Not pleasing the Instagram, Facebook or YouTube algorithm is also part of the experiment.

We are aware that this means our content is penalised compared to others, or that our channels could be closed. We are also aware that today, we have to be direct.

Let's return to the question. The themes we focus on can be divided into two parts. It is in our interest to talk about communism, what the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union meant. Also the progress that the revolutionary wave generated by the October Revolution brought to the world. We speak about these realities in order to dismantle anti-communist propaganda.

We also have an interest in commenting on the reality around us. For example, we have written several articles on Palestine, on the struggle in solidarity with the Palestinian people, in solidarity with those who have been

affected by repression for siding with the Palestinian resistance against the genocidal IDF army.

It is not only the desire to comment on reality; in what we write, there is above all the desire to offer a different (direct) point of view and a direction. For example, in the song '*Linea di condotta*', we talk about how to deal with repression, the attitude to adopt towards the police, the mentality we must adopt so as not to be overwhelmed by repression: "*these are not crimes you accuse me of, but legitimate actions of a class that is rising up, fighting for power*".

As for the left wing of NATO, in one song we talk specifically about the situation in Italy: a protectorate of the United States, a country under military occupation, deprived of national sovereignty, where foreign and domestic policy is defined by the United States, the EU, the Zionists and the Vatican. But here again, we do not limit ourselves to denunciation, we say it clearly: employers and financiers, capitalists, the European Union, Zionists, NATO and the Vatican, there is no possible reconciliation, a new Liberation is needed.

We have written a few texts inspired by the glorious days of mobilisation and strikes for Palestine in September and October 2025, in order to indicate a perspective (let's block everything, absolutely everything, until the minister leaves the ministry, until they capitulate).

Ultimately, the themes we deal with concern the class struggle underway in our country and around the world. The content we want to convey always seeks to go beyond simple denunciation and to provide guidance and practical advice. The song 'Come il gatto con i topi' (Like the cat with the mice) is perhaps one of our favourites in this sense: It is not true that the class struggle is over, won by the bosses and lost by the masses. Those who say so are out of touch, those who believe it have fallen into the trap. Instead of fighting, 'we succumb'. The truth is that we must organise ourselves, give ourselves the means to fight, and fight to win.

4) There is a total 'contempt' on the part of the 'NATO left' for the interests and guarantees of the working classes. In Italy in the 1970s, there was a musical group, Assemblea Teatrale Musicale, which, through the song 'I ricchi' (The Rich) on the 1977 album "Marilyn", mocked the bourgeois culture of the 'left': - Stalinist Russia, which allows no freedom of expression to artists... - and the rich have studied and also know how to appreciate the dramatic nature of popular song - Today, we are completely overwhelmed by the cult of the 'ghetto' and "subcultures". It is a fundamental task for those who want to counter imperialist cultural hegemony to break out of these 'cages'. In your creative approach, you have rejected the bourgeois function of the "artist". What are your plans

for the future?

We have written an article on cultural hegemony entitled '*Egemonia'*. It is an invitation to problematise Gramsci. In Italy, we have a serious problem with Gramsci: he made fundamental theoretical contributions to the global communist movement and is studied all over the world (in India, Peru, Nepal, Venezuela, China), but we don't study him in Italy, where he is at best read through the prism of Togliatti's words (who was, however, a revisionist...).

Even if we don't study him, everyone likes to quote him. One of his phrases in particular is overused: '*I live, I am a partisan, therefore I hate those who do not take sides. I hate the indifferent.*' There you have it. We believe that it is not so much Gramsci who should be questioned, but rather the attitude of all those comrades, activists and vanguards of the struggle who think it is healthy to hate the 'indifferent'. We ourselves have quoted this phrase in the past. Anyone who is politically active in Italy has come across this quote. The fact is that, as communists, we cannot afford to hate those who, under the influence of the imperialist bourgeoisie, are indifferent today. Rather, we must understand how to win over those who are indifferent today. For without the working class and without the masses, there is no revolution.

Thus, combating the hegemony of the bourgeoisie in the cultural sphere is a tool of revolutionary political struggle, and that is what we are trying to do with this project. For ideas can become a material force when they are assimilated by the masses. This means that we must not denigrate the masses, but – to quote Gramsci himself – "*care for them, educate them and organise them"*. For those who hesitated this time will fight with us tomorrow, to quote a slogan from the 1970s.

The future of the project will depend on the results obtained by this provocation. It is clear that we will no longer be useful when militant artists go beyond denunciation, when they talk about socialist revolution, the October Revolution, organising, putting an end to the world of bosses, and it will be even better if Ghali, Marracash or other more established artists use their role and visibility to go beyond denunciation. It is not so much us who need to step out of our niche, but the real artists who need to put themselves at the service of the class struggle and the popular masses.

If you would like to listen to us or contact us, you can find us on Soundcloud and YouTube, on Instagram and Facebook, by searching for '*Gli artisti che non abbiamo*' (The artists we don't have).

Creativity and individual freedom in Marxism

Mikhail Lifshitz

The historical role of the capitalist mode of production is to highlight the contradictions of social progress; at the same time, it paves the way for the elimination of all these inequalities and antagonisms. The very division of labour gives rise to contradictions between the three “elements”: “productive forces”, “social relations” and “consciousness”. However, the social division of labour is not an eternal category. As a social stratification of society, it disappears, and as a professional hierarchy, it dies out in the transition to communist society.

But what does this transition mean in terms of aesthetic creation? Does it not mean the destruction of all distinctions between the aesthetic and the non-aesthetic in art, just as in life the contradiction between the artist and the ordinary mortal is removed? Does collectivism, in general, not suppress all individual originality and talent? These are some of the bourgeois objections to communism. Marx and Engels addressed these objections in their critique of Max Stirner's book, The Ego and Its Own. Stirner, one of the founders of anarchism, distinguished between ‘human’ labour, which can be organised collectively, and ‘individual’ labour, which cannot be socialised under any circumstances. For who can replace a Mozart or a Raphael?

Marx and Engels wrote:

"Here again, as always, Sancho [i.e., Stirner] is unlucky in his choice of concrete examples. He thinks that 'no one can compose your music for you, nor carry out your painting projects. Raphael's works cannot be realised by anyone else'. But Sancho should have known that it was not Mozart himself, but someone else, who largely composed and entirely completed Mozart's Requiem, and that Raphael “executed” only a small part of his frescoes.

Stirner imagines that the so-called organisers of work want to organise all the activities of each individual, when in fact it is precisely they who make the distinction between directly productive work, which must be organised, and work that is not directly productive. With regard to the latter type of work, they do not think, as Sancho imagines, that anyone can work in Raphael's place, but rather that all those who have a Raphael within them should be able to develop without hindrance. Sancho imagines that Raphael created his

paintings independently of the division of labour that existed in Rome at the time. If he compares Raphael to Leonardo da Vinci and Titian, he will see how much the former's works of art were conditioned by the rise of Rome, then under the influence of Florence; how Leonardo's works were conditioned by the social milieu of Florence, and later those of Titian by the quite different development of Venice. Raphael, like any other artist, was conditioned by the technical advances made in art before him, by the organisation of society and the division of labour in his locality, and finally, by the division of labour in all the countries with which his locality had relations. The ability of an individual like Raphael to develop his talent depends entirely on demand, which in turn depends on the division of labour and the educational conditions that result from it.

By proclaiming the individual nature of scientific and artistic work, S

tirner places himself well below the bourgeoisie. Already in our time, it has become necessary to organise this ‘individual’ activity. Horace Vernet would not have had time to produce a tenth of his paintings if he had considered them works that ‘only this individual can accomplish’. In Paris, the enormous demand for vaudeville and novels gave rise to an organisation of labour for the production of these goods, which are in any case better than their ‘individual’ competitors in Germany. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, The German Ideology

Thus, bourgeois society itself attempts to organise the higher forms of intellectual labour. "It goes without saying, however, that all these organisations based on the modern division of labour still achieve very inadequate results and represent progress only in relation to the short-sighted self-sufficiency that existed until now.

But this so-called “organisation of labour” must not be confused with communism. In communist society, these confused questions concerning the disparity between highly gifted individuals and the masses disappear. 'The exclusive concentration of artistic talent in certain individuals and its consequent suppression in the broad masses of the people are an effect of the division of labour. Even if, in certain social relations, everyone could become an excellent painter, this would not prevent everyone from also being an original painter, so that here too, the difference between “human” work and “individual” work becomes pure nonsense. In a communist organisation of society, the artist is not confined by the local and national isolation that results solely from the division of labour, nor is the individual confined to a specific art, so that he becomes exclusively a painter, sculptor, etc. ; these very names sufficiently express the narrowness of his professional development and his dependence on the division of labour. In a communist society, there are no painters, but at most men who, among other things, also paint." Far from suppressing personal originality, collectivism actually offers the only solid ground for the full development of personality. Marx and Engels stated this forcefully in The German Ideology. They knew very well that a new cycle of artistic progress can only begin with the victory of the proletariat, the abolition of private property and the generalisation of communist relations. Only then can all the forces currently exhausted by capitalist oppression be liberated. ‘The destruction of private property is the complete assimilation of all human feelings and characteristics.’ The new society, wrote Marx, criticising “crude” and levelling communism, does not represent ‘the abstract negation of all education and civilisation’. It does not propose ‘to suppress talent by force’. On the contrary, "in communist society—the only society in which the original and free development of individuals is not a mere slogan—this development depends precisely on the association of individuals, an association based partly on economic premises, partly on the solidarity necessary for the free development of all, and finally on the universal activity

of individuals in accordance with the available productive forces. The question here therefore concerns individuals at a specific historical level of development, and not individuals taken at random... Naturally, these individuals' awareness of their mutual relationships is also completely different, and as far removed from the “principle of love” or devotion as it is from selfishness." Communist society eliminates not only the abstract contradiction between ‘work and pleasure,’ but also the very real contradiction between feeling and reason, between ‘the interplay of physical and mental forces’ and ‘conscious will.’ With the abolition of classes and the gradual disappearance of the contradiction between physical and intellectual labour, comes the complete development of the whole individual, which the greatest social thinkers could only dream of until then. Only communist society, in which ‘the associated producers rationally regulate their exchanges with nature, subjecting it to their common control, instead of being governed by it as by a blind power,’ can establish the material basis for "the development of human forces, which is its proper end, the true realm of freedom... The reduction of the working day is the fundamental condition for this. Karl Marx. Capital

According to Marx's doctrine, communism therefore creates the conditions necessary for the flourishing of culture and art, in comparison to which the limited possibilities offered by the democracy of slaves to a privileged few must necessarily seem derisory. ‘Art is dead! LONG LIVE ART!’ Such is the slogan of Marx's aesthetic.

Excerpt from the book: The Philosophy of Art by Karl Marx (1931) by Mikhail Lifshit

Interview with our Ecuadorian comrades MGTL
Movimiento Guevarista Tierra y Libertad de Ecuador - Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores

1) Can you tell us about your organisation?

The MGTL-PRT is a revolutionary, Marxist-Leninist organisation that fights for the construction of the Revolutionary Party of the Ecuadorian People, national liberation and socialism. The result of decades of struggle by the Ecuadorian people, we recognise ourselves as heirs to the insurgent struggles of the 1980s and 1990s. Our ranks include comrades who were activists in Alfaro Vive Carajo and Montoneras Patria Libre, who fought against the Ecuadorian state's armed forces, who were internationalists, who were imprisoned in the dungeons of the bourgeoisie, but we also recognise ourselves as heirs to the great popular struggles of the 1990s, during which the Ecuadorian people overthrew three presidents. We are also the children of the proletariat, the peasants and the indigenous peoples. We are popular fighters from among precarious workers, street vendors, self-employed workers, labourers, peasants and the unemployed. We are the proletariat organising its own party, its own fighting front. The Ecuadorian people recognise us as their fighting force. the Guevarists are present in all just struggles where the people need our presence. We have earned our reputation through the sweat of our brow in street fighting, in reclaiming haciendas, in fighting against mining companies, in defending community land, in enduring persecution and political imprisonment without ever backing down.

2) What is the current social and political situation in Ecuador? What are the links between economic power, politics and criminal organisations? How does US imperialism manifest itself?

Ecuador is a narco-state, a veritable black hole of capital. It is the most violent country in the region and the source of tons of drugs shipped daily to Europe and the United States. We are experiencing a veritable drug war in which it is the workers who are paying with their lives. We are experiencing a serious economic and social crisis as a result of the implementation of IMF policies. The current president, a cacique named Noboa, and his entire court of landowning lumpenbourgeoisie have used the state to promote their own business interests, thereby ruining the country. There are no medicines in the hospitals, and dozens of children die every day from hospital bacteria that proliferate because the government does not even pay for hospital cleaning. Education is in ruins; the caciquista regime has not only failed to build a single school, but is closing down those that already exist. Drug trafficking is

rampant because the Creole bourgeoisie is a narco-bourgeoisie. Reports from the United States itself have shown that all the big bourgeoisie's businesses are involved in drug trafficking. We are governed by criminals. Former President Guillermo Lasso owns the Bank of Guayaquil, which has been designated as the mafia's main money launderer, and current President Noboa owns the Noboa Trading company, which was under investigation for drug trafficking.

Gringo imperialism totally controls the country. Noboa is a bootlicker, first of Biden, now of Trump. Recently, the delinquent Marco Rubio was here and Noboa bowed down at his feet for 13 million dollars. The gringos have an interest in controlling Ecuador's ports, as this control would give them hegemony in the drug trade. We are subject to the worst cartel in the world: the DEA. Ecuador is a semi-colonial country, which is why we have defined our struggle as primarily a struggle for national liberation. We must first expel the gringos and their lackeys in order to move towards socialism.

3) Which social sectors are most active in the current resistance in Ecuador? How does the 'indigenous' question manifest itself today and how does it relate to the class question?

As always, the working class and peasant sectors. At the moment, the country is in the throes of a transport strike that has been supported by peasant communities and organised sectors in the cities. In our view, the current Ecuadorian proletariat is composed of the unemployed, the self-employed, precarious workers, precarious labourers and displaced peasants. The organisations emerging from this proletariat are of a new type, not as a matter of rhetoric, but as a historical necessity. That is why the most combative sectors in recent years are the organisations that have understood this new reality and are made up of this proletariat in transformation. Among these organisations are the MGTL-PRT, the comrades of Acción Antifascista, the Vientos del Pueblo Movement, the Puka Inti Party, and certain sectors of the PCE that have returned to Marxism-Leninism. The indigenous people are a force for struggle, but they are not an abstraction as some indigenist sectors would have us believe. Formal organisations have been dominated by the indigenous bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie, the very ones who have led them into electoralism and opportunism and who have sold the blood of the uprisings on the negotiating tables with the fascists. We grow up among poor peasants and we are poor peasants ourselves, we strengthen ourselves in cultural issues and the Andean worldview, we have political schools in the communities, our militants are indigenous, poor peasants and we fight reformism, political clientelism, opportunism, we never play the game of bourgeois democracy. That is why the class enemy struck us in 2022 in rural areas. But it doesn't matter, we are like the rushes that are cut at the side of the river bed, little by little, we have started to grow again.

4) To be reborn, the current revolutionary left must look to the future

and confront direct resistance, getting rid of the old 'reactionary' and 'liberal' left. In Europe, the NATO and postmodern left continues today to contribute to the campaign against the masses and against communism. What, in your opinion, are the main guidelines for Marxist-Leninists today?

We Marxist-Leninists have only one main task: the reconstruction of the communist parties. Without a party, there can be no revolution. We must block the path and expel reformism and revisionism. We must fight resolutely against fascism and social democracy. We must rebuild the workers' movement, the peasant movement, popular neighbourhood organisations, anti-fascist fronts and other instruments of proletarian struggle. The other major task is the reconstruction of the Communist International, a process that is underway and which, we are sure, will be achieved sooner or later. Finally, the duty of every revolutionary is to make revolution, and revolution is a real and concrete practice, not of words but of actions.

5) What is the situation of the revolutionary left in Ecuador? Are there any revolutionary political prisoners in Ecuador?

Despite the blows it has suffered, the revolutionary left is standing strong, in the process of rebuilding and uniting. It is a difficult path, but we are travelling it. The struggle against the fascist cacique Noboa has forced us to make great strides in unity. Currently, popular assemblies are operating in several provinces of the country, where the struggle and resistance are being organised. We have

experienced organisation in the streets, in the neighbourhoods and in the struggle against the police. It has gone well, but we want to continue moving forward. Yes, the MGTL-PRT has three political prisoners: comrade Omar Campoverde, a member of our national coordination; comrade Gabriela Gallardo, who is part of Socorro Rojo Latinoamérica; and comrade Carlos Carguachi, a historic indigenous leader from the centre of the country. All three were arrested with five other comrades on 19 May 2022 during a national operation. Another comrade managed to escape capture, but he also had to face the bogus trial set up by the prosecution. The trial was purely a judicial masquerade. The nine comrades were accused of 'human trafficking for the purposes of armed conflict' for allegedly taking 'deceived' people to undergo military training in the Segunda Marquetalia in Colombia. Obviously, such an absurd accusation collapsed on its own and could never be proven, despite the fabrication of evidence and testimonies, an absolute masquerade. After a ridiculous trial in which the police admitted that they had never seen the comrades commit any crime, in which the transcripts of telephone calls were in fact their 'interpretations', in which their witnesses contradicted themselves and accused each other, on the day of the verdict, the judges were intimidated by officials from the US embassy in Ecuador and ended up convicting the three comrades, based on testimony that the judges

themselves had rejected, and on documents from a supposed preliminary international investigation that were nothing more than sheets of paper with no legal value. This is what Ecuadorian narco-justice looks like... In addition to our three comrades, who have been awaiting their appeal hearing for three years now, there are hundreds of social activists and land defenders who have been criminalised and persecuted at the national level, and in 2023, comrade Victor Guayllas, imprisoned since the 2019 uprising and accused of terrorism, was dismembered in Guayaquil prison during one of the dozens of riots that have taken place in the death prisons of Ecuador, that black hole of capitalism.

6) The South American continent has different types of governments, from the reformist left in Chile and Brazil to the liberal right in Argentina, to the popular government in Venezuela (under attack from the United States). Are there any attempts by the revolutionary left in South America to create networks of connection and debate between groups, organisations and parties of the revolutionary left?

Of course, in addition to Socorro Rojo Latinoamérica, which defends political prisoners in the region, there are regional processes such as the Coordinadora Guevarista Internacional and other informal spaces. For us, internationalism is fundamental, not only in the struggle for political prisoners, but also in supporting the various struggles that peoples are waging against the bourgeoisie and imperialism. There are also multiple international processes of solidarity with Palestine.

7) Your reference to the figure of CHE is fundamental. What keeps Guevarist theory and practice 'alive' today?

Che is immortal because he is the living example of the sacrifice that every communist must make for the emancipation of our class. To give up everything, to sacrifice all happiness in life, we tell comrades who join the MGTL-PRT that when they ask to fight with us, they are 'signing' a contract in which they give up their lives and their freedom for the cause of our class, because a true revolutionary is one until victory or death, there are no half measures. Che defined this revolutionary ethic. We despise the 'revolutionaries' of weekends, NGOs, parties and cafés. we respect those who live 24 hours a day for the Revolution, those who do not care about the cost of the decision taken, those who have paid with their freedom, their exile, the death of loved ones or comrades, and who continue to fight. We tell our comrades that we must be like Che, that is, risk our lives to prove our truths; we must be like Julius Fucik, fighting in the face of adversity; we must be like those who preceded us in the struggle. Finally, we tell our activists to be courageous, that courage is not the absence of fear, but the act of overcoming it for the cause, and that in order to be able to do so and to do so always, until the end, in freedom or in prison, working legally or clandestinely, we must be profound students of our ideology. that is what it means to be Guevarist, the

best fighters in the countryside and the cities

Notes

[←1]

Anti-Imperialist Front website: anti-imperialistfront.org A page in French and several social networks are also available.

[←2]

We use this term to refer generically to the Western left, with all its liberal, postmodern and other paradigms.

[←3]

The protests, under the motto *"Bloquons tout"* ("Block Everything"), were largely in response to the government's 2026 austerity budget, which included cuts to public services and social programs.

[←4]

For Lenin, imperialism is not a particular policy or economy, but represents a systemic dimension in which contradictions become increasingly ‘extreme’. That said, we do not describe Russia and China as imperialist, as their development is not comparable to that of the United States and NATO countries. It is also wrong to simplistically put Russia and China on the same level, both in terms of their internal social composition and at the international strategic level.

[←5]

Far-right politicians or outright neo-fascists

[←6]

The Trilateral Commission (Trilateral) is a private organisation created in 1973 on the initiative of the main leaders of the Bilderberg Group and the Council on Foreign Relations, including David Rockefeller, Henry Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski. This commission marked the starting point of modern ideological warfare: the defence of imperialism by military, cultural and other means against all forms of resistance and popular power. It is the formalisation of a technical elite serving the ruling classes and imperialism itself.

[←7]

We sometimes witness logical short circuits: on the one hand, propaganda is used against the army and young people in precarious situations and the unemployed are encouraged not to enlist, while on the other hand, French warships are called upon to intervene to protect pacifists... We believe that it is wrong, and linked to imperialist cultural hegemony, which has always had as its primary objective the demilitarisation of the masses (both mentally and physically), to campaign against enlistment in the army. The duty of progressive and revolutionary forces is to fight for the democratisation of the army and its use by the people.

[←8]

At the ‘system’ level, we are in a volcanic production and anarchic market, which makes scarcity an artificial factor produced not by natural elements, but by the current division of labour.

[←9]

‘From genocide in Gaza to global warming and the Uberisation of labour’, Ricardo Antunes, 2025, revuesupernova.org

[←10]

Mao's work ‘Against Liberalism’, published in 1937, is, in its simplicity and clarity, an indispensable tool for understanding the flaws of archaic, bourgeois and imperialist ideology. Mao, communist style, Contradiction Editions, 2022

[←11]

We are referring mainly to the contribution of the USSR and the countries of the socialist bloc, before the revisionist wave that followed Stalin's death, of the People's Republic of China, socialist Albania, Cuba and the popular and anti-imperialist experiences that have swept and continue to sweep across Africa, Asia and South America. We have no cult to defend, but it is clear that for us, these represent concrete experiences where the popular masses organised themselves and took collective forms. The limitations of these experiences must never make us forget that they represented a concrete break with imperialism. We must look to the future, but their contribution remains a necessary example from which we must necessarily start.

[←12]

For France, we have published an anthology with our publishing house on French experiences of armed struggle and revolutionary violence: Frédéric Oriach, La lutte armée, Contradiction Edition, 2024

[←13]

‘Neocolonialism, occupation of the mind and voluntary slavery: forms of contemporary imperialist domination’, Anti-Imperialist Front, 2025

[←14]

In this context, the URC and the LJR-JR are among the most interesting and active actors in the French proletarian left today.

[←15]

Interview with Euskal Herriko Marxista-Leninista (Euskadi) revuesupernova.com/interview-a-euskal-herriko-marxista-leninista-euskadi/

[←16]

Died on 5 May 1981 following a hunger strike carried through to the end, as a form of protest against the prison regime to which republican prisoners were subjected. During the strike, which lasted until 3 October 1981, nine other prisoners died with Sands in British imperialist prisons.

[←17]

Fasting was already used as a means of protest in pre-Christian Ireland, where it was known as troscadh or cealachan.

[←18]

The self-dissolution of the PKK: revuesupernova.com/lauto-dissolution-du-pkk
Historic betrayal of the Kurdish people and the peoples of the world by the PKK: revuesupernova.com/trahison-historique-du-peuple-kurde-et-des-peuples-du-monde-par-le-pkk/

[←19]

At dawn on 19 December 2000, the Turkish state launched Operation “Return to Life”, aimed at suppressing the struggle of imprisoned political prisoners. Since 20 October, more than 800 activists linked to various left-wing organisations had been on hunger strike against the introduction of F-type isolation cells. From 19 to 22 December, 20 prisons were stormed simultaneously with the deployment of nearly 9,000 soldiers. More than 20,000 phosphorus bombs were used and thousands of live rounds were fired at defenceless prisoners. During those three days, 28 prisoners were killed, 300 were wounded and 600 were left disabled for life.

[←20]

The most hypocritical, as usual, were the liberal and Trotskyist elements, who explicitly condemned the revolutionary action and thus his identity as a political prisoner, presenting it as a civil rights case... This is the same thing we have seen with regard to the Palestinian resistance... So we had pro-Palestinian supporters cheering on the pro-imperialist and Zionist governments of Syria, or inviting imperialist warships to intervene to defend the pro-Palestinians...